The American Journal of ECONOMICS and SOCIOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
JUL 30 1951
PERIODICAL READING ROOM

Theory of Value in Social Science—*W. G. O'Donnell* 333
Philanthropy and Peace—*R. Claughton* 345
George's Remedies for Britain's Land Problems—*E. P. Lawrence* . . 357
Current Minority Policies and Their Implementation in International Unions—*J. Hope II* 371
Price-Fixing and Planned Economy—*J. and R. Lacour-Gayet* 389
Population and Resources—*W. Lissner* 400
Max Weber, Assassination, and German Guilt—*H. Becker* 401
Land-Capability Inventory Maps—*T. S. Harding* 406
Corn Law Rhymes—*F. Neilson* 407
Multiple Crop Insurance—*T. S. Harding* 415
Treason to Liberty—*M. M. Korshak* 416
Gas and Ice Monopolies in Toledo—*R. H. Bremner* 417
Basis of Scientific Land Reform—*J. C. Lincoln* 429
Philosophy of Social Inquiry (Review)—*H. S. Fries* 431
Who Makes Wars? (Review)—*W. Lissner* 437
On Defeating the Communist Menace (Comment)—*K. L. Hansen* . . 442
Contributors 444

VOL. 10 JULY, 1951 NO. 4

Published QUARTERLY under grant from the ROBERT SCHALKENBACH FOUNDATION in the interest of constructive synthesis in the social sciences.

The AMERICAN JOURNAL *of* ECONOMICS *and* SOCIOLOGY

Published QUARTERLY under grant from the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation in the interest of constructive synthesis in the social sciences.

WILL LISSNER
Editor

BOARD OF EDITORS

†FRANZ OPPENHEIMER
Hollywood, Calif.

JOHN ISE
University of Kansas

HAROLD HOTELLING
Univ. of North Carolina

GLENN E. HOOVER
Mills College

GEORGE RAYMOND GEIGER
Antioch College

RAYMOND E. CRIST
University of Maryland

HARRY GUNNISON BROWN
University of Missouri

MORTIMER J. ADLER
University of Chicago

WALLACE KIBBEE
Typographical Designer

WILLIAM S. O'CONNOR
Counsel

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

HAROLD S. BUTTENHEIM
New York

PHILIP H. CORNICK
New York

JOHN DEWEY, LL.D.
New York

PHYLLIS EVANS, M.A.
New York

ROY A. FOULKE, M.A.
New York

LANCASTER M. GREENE
New York

E. C. HARWOOD, M.B.A.
Great Barrington, Mass.

L. G. LIGUTTI, LL.D.
Des Moines

GROVER C. LOUD, M.A.
New York

ADOLPH LOWE, DR.JUR.
New York

DONALD A. MACLEAN, PH.D.
Washington

FRANCIS NEILSON, LITT.D
New York

LAWSON PURDY, LL.D.
New York

JOSEPH S. ROUCEK, PH.D.
Bridgeport, Conn.

LOUIS WALLIS
New York

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIOLOGY, INC. (a non-profit membership corporation) publisher.

O. K. DORN
President

CHARLES JOHNSON POST
Vice President

ALBERT PLEYDELL
Vice President

V. G. PETERSON
Secretary-Treasurer

W. LISSNER, G. R. GEIGER, H. G. BROWN, O. K. DORN, C. J. POST, A. PLEYDELL, directors

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF ECONOMICS AND SOCIOLOGY is published quarterly, in October, January, April and July. Published at North Queen Street and McGovern Avenue, Lancaster, Pennsylvania. Executive offices, 50 East Sixty-ninth Street, New York 21. Subscription, $3.00 a year. Single copies, $1.00. Checks payable to the American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc. Correspondence concerning contributions should be addressed to the editor at the Journal's offices. Correspondence concerning subscriptions and other business matters should be addressed to the secretary at the Journal's offices. The editor and the members of the board of editors do not necessarily endorse opinions and statements in signed contributions, and are not necessarily in agreement with any contributions whose publication they recommend. The members of the editorial advisory board do not necessarily endorse the Journal's orientation. Entered as second class matter at the post office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Registration of title in the U. S. Patent Office pending.

Copyright, 1951, by the American Journal of Economics and Sociology, Inc.

The AMERICAN JOURNAL *of* ECONOMICS *and* SOCIOLOGY

Published QUARTERLY under grant from the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation in the interest of constructive synthesis in the social sciences.

VOLUME 10 JULY, 1951 NUMBER 4

The Theory of Value in Social Science

By WALTER G. O'DONNELL

IT HAS BEEN FASHIONABLE in past years for many intellectual authorities to exclude values and value judgments from the proper area of scientific investigation. It has been persistently alleged that the scientific method of inquiry is not applicable to human choices, preferences, appraisals, valuations, values, and ethical judgments. Both in the physical and social sciences this dualistic notion has long been prevalent, consigning values to a quasi-mystical or transcendental domain of the imagination in which these supposedly unique propositions of value judgment operate—strategically—beyond the reach of scientific inquiry. The tough-minded materialist is often as vehement as the starry-eyed mystic in his refusal to allow scientific research to enter this Forbidden Land of value theory. This question of the logical and scientific status of values and value judgments has arisen repeatedly in every field of science and philosophy[1] and it is not the purpose of this essay to penetrate this central problem of the philosophy of science, but, rather, to present a general prospectus of the useful impact of the restoration of a theory of value to a central position in social science, with particular reference to economic theory.

I

IN ITS EARLIEST PERIOD of development, economics was essentially concerned with moral philosophy and value theory, both Adam Smith and

[1] See "Value, A Co-operative Inquiry," edited by Ray Lepley (New York: Columbia Press, 1949) for a thoroughly interesting discussion of this fundamental issue of value by a number of scientists and philosophers responding, variously, to the searching questions of John Dewey.

Malthus having ventured into whatever field their problem carried them, regardless of formal departmental barriers; but the predominantly individualistic and competitive nature of transactions in their day narrowed their theoretical conceptions of value to a bilateral exchange relationship which became the basis for Ricardo's rigorous economic analysis and the ethos of orthodox economic thought ever since. The utilitarian philosophical tradition established by Jeremy Bentham lent a humanitarian impulse and respectability to this same orientation, but neither Marshall nor Marx succeeded in their endeavors to elevate the Ricardian orthodoxy to the higher plane of social utility. A theoretical system cannot rise above its framework of reference and philosophical foundations merely by internal modifications and refinements; the reconstruction of economic theory requires a new foundation of common values and guideposts to their realization through the economical management of resources, public policy, and economic planning. In the predominant academic "pure theory" of orthodox British and American economists of the marginalist, mathematical, and other neo-classical schools of thought, value theory has been eclipsed by price theory; and their absorption in the deductive and detached refinement and complication of the dated propositions of the classical tradition leaves no room for a comprehension of the strategic elements of social value excluded from their scope of inquiry.

The resulting divorce of ethics from economics, both theoretically and practically, has for its costly consequence the incongruity, tensions, and disorders of a neurotic modern society of individuals frustrated in their collective aspirations. Lawrence K. Frank, in his essay on "The Emancipation of Economics,"[2] points to the need for new patterns of socio-economic behavior:

> It is not possible to develop a *social* life until we discover what new habits of social behavior are needed to replace the present and how to do the replacing . . . our historically developed practices are habits of person-to-person behavior in which mutual coercion is permitted and encouraged, whereas the machine industry and its concomitant activities call for group activities and habits of co-ordinated living.

The problematic situations of our day and age find orthodox economic theory really "value-less" in the guidance of collective action. If modern economic society is to get its bearings in these troubled times, it must have explanatory and directive socio-economic theories with a definite point of reference, ends-in-view, and social norms scientifically defined in terms of their constituent values.

[2] "Society as Patient" (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1949) p. 59.

The problem of analyzing and understanding the value-ingredients of the normative rules of institutional life, present or prospective, is a task worthy of the co-operative efforts of scientific investigators and theorists from several interrelated fields of science and philosophy. Optimum value, in the broadest material sense, can be realized by society only by the fullest use of available science and technology to close the gap between the world of actual events and empirically established norms of human welfare. In this process of relieving the tensions of dynamic social progress (or disintegration) means and ends are so intermingled that no branch of science can reasonably concern itself merely with means, nor merely with ends. Moreover, the process of social reconstruction is unending, continually confronted with the problems of change and disorder and concerned with the emergent values of the progress of society. The importance of this problem of values is being recognized by scientists of social insight in a spreading area of investigation; it is no longer so fashionable for a scientist to shrug his shoulders at the mention of values and consign the whole problem to the philosophers.

II

FORMERLY IT WAS CUSTOMARY among scientists with a strong positivistic bias to greet any serious mention of the subject of value with smugly disdainful allusions to "metaphysics," "romanticism," and "mysticism," but the present resurgence of scientific and philosophical interest in values stems from the opposite positions of positivism and romanticism. John Dewey, as well as F. S. C. Northrop, Durkheim as well as Sombart, Pareto as well as Max Weber, Pound as well as Kelsen, have manifested increasing interest in the study of values. Although still methodologically immature, and with the crudity and sketchiness that characterize intellectual pioneering, this new attention to the theory of value is becoming manifest in an increasing volume of significant material.

In sociology the major effort is still devoted to empirical social research and the analysis of social processes, and some of this inductive and statistical work may prove useful in a later stage of general theoretical construction; however, C. H. Cooley, Durkheim, and Bouglé have laid the foundations for a theory of social value, and the educational sociologists, such as A. C. Angell, Chancellor, Peters, Snedden, and W. R. Smith, continue to place emphasis on sociological research as a basis for the values and social goals of education. Thomas Huxley, Levy-Bruhl, Kropotkin, and Lester Ward, among others, have sought the principles of social ethics and morality through their sociological investigations, while E. C. Hayes

has gone a long way toward uniting a Christian ethics with a scientific sociological theory.

These sociological explorations in value, ethics, morality, and religion, however various in other regards, are among the most significant trends in modern intellectual development, representing a great endeavor to restore the congruity of our pattern of culture by bringing the mores, value-system, and ethos of Western civilization into harmonious relationship with the collective needs and vital requirements of modern man in his revolutionized technological environment. The widening recognition of the urgency of a clarification of value phenomena is indicated in the recent establishment of two endowed professorships at Cornell and Harvard devoted to the study of values. Theories of value, the goals of collective behavior, and the institutions that embody the controls of human conduct must be kept or made relevant to the life-sustaining, constructive, and creative impulses of man. When theories become irrelevant for the guidance of human conduct, "sociotic" individuals, neurotic societies, and cultural crises and disintegration are to be expected. Approaching this problem of cultural incongruity—the split personality of modern society—from different directions, scientists and philosophers of quite different persuasions may find themselves on common ground eventually. Theories of value—and ethics—are coming back into the social sciences, a reunion following a long separation.

Value theory is coming to occupy an increasingly important position in other social sciences. In cultural anthropology, Malinowski and Kroeber have given particular attention to values in various cultures; and, although the earlier entries in the files of the Cross-Cultural Survey of the Institute of Human Relations at Yale University have scant references under this heading, the more recent entries have more copious notations regarding values. In modern jurisprudence, the works of Duguit, Durkheim, and Kelsen are outstanding in their concern with the theory of value. In history, F. Tannenbaum has dealt profoundly with social values in considering various theories of culture and historical development, and Rickert has pointed out that history, as a selective record of development, must have reference to values in the selection of the significant events in a developmental series; if not actually an evaluational or normative science, history is certainly related closely to values, and if the significant is to be recorded in history, the importance of events must be evaluated. In social psychology, James, Dewey, and Mead, and the whole "transactional" or interactionist group of social philosophers (including Cooley, the sociologist), have concentrated their attention upon group attitudes

as related to environmental situations in which the factor of value must be considered as strategic. John Dewey's interest in values and valuation has been continuous throughout his career, and in his educational philosophy social problems are examined largely from the standpoint of social psychology, leading thence to principles of social ethics. In economics, which once claimed value as its special province of investigation, value has become adumbrated and uncritically identified with price in the circular reasoning of orthodox economic theory; more recently an improvement, by way of frankness, is being registered in the complete abandonment of the term itself in some texts, with some neo-classical economists, like Lionel Robbins, explicitly denying that economics has anything to do with value judgments—a position, by the way, which involves a sweeping value judgment sustaining a whole system of values embodied in the institutional *status quo*.

At a time when leading scholars in other sciences are shedding all pretences of ethical neutrality and facing up consciously to the problems of value in order to promote those institutional developments which conduce to freedom of inquiry and other social values, those who preside jealously over the rigid core of "pure" economic theory in the classical tradition imagine themselves defending the ramparts of the only thoroughly scientific social science against the disconcerting impact of the outer "non-economic" institutional forces of culture and morality beyond their ken. This is a proper prescription for the preservation of theoretical antiquities. By mistaking the logical precision of theories deduced from convenient premises and assumptions for an explanation of the world of actual affairs outside their set of assumptions (what Whitehead calls the "fallacy of misplaced concreteness") these theorists, in their various magnitudes of brilliance, are throwing their weight into the cultural lag and giving to economic theory a reputation for useless detachment.

III

FORTUNATELY, INFLUENTIAL GROUPS of heterodox economists have broken out of the classical containers in an endeavor to accumulate facts and formulate theories as a basis for the intelligent formation of public policy, studying the institutional environment in which economic activity takes place, and delving into values and whatever phenomena they encounter in their search for the solution of problems. Among these, J. B. Clark,[3] J. M. Clark, B. M. Anderson, A. B. Wolfe, J. R. Commons,[4] C. E.

[3] "Philosophy of Wealth" (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1886).

[4] "Economics of Collective Action" (New York: Macmillan Company, 1950) ch. XI.

Ayres, and Mukerjee[5] have been especially concerned with value theory.

Most of the American economists who have manifested a distinct interest in the theory of value have been identified, generally, with the Institutionalist orientation in American economic thought, but they are not in close agreement as to the meaning of value, and only a few of them accord the theory of value a central position in their thinking.

In J. B. Clark's early work, "The Philosophy of Wealth," value is defined as the "quantitative measure of utility,"[6] and five pages afterwards he states that "effective, and not absolute, utility is the basis of wealth and value," but in between it is noted that utility and value are inseparable but not identical. J. B. Clark's major contribution, however, is to be found in his emphasis on the study of value from the organic viewpoint of society as a whole, and his later systematic efforts to develop a theory of social utility.

With a somewhat similar orientation, J. M. Clark relies upon "organic social valuation"—in contrast with market valuation—in the formulation of his theory of social values. The younger Clark is convinced that the theory of economic efficiency cannot be handled effectively from the standpoint of a *social* science without a corresponding concern for the whole problem of human values and their organization.[7] Stressing the importance of investigating the institutional origins of social values, Clark is hopeful that a concept of social valuation can be developed, on an objective basis, for scientific application to actual cases in order to reduce the discrepancies between social and market valuations.[8] B. M. Anderson contributed a lucid treatment of the theory of social value, but relapsed into an orthodox coma near the end of his book, when he wrote, "And the great bulk of pure economic theory, and practically all that is of greatest importance in pure theory, is in the theory of prices, and not in the theory of value."[9] Then he took refuge in a narrow concept of the "mission" of an economist and never emerged from retirement.

John R. Commons, thoroughly versed in the legal aspects of reasonable value, devotes a chapter to "Valuation: The Economists' Theory of Value," his last work,[10] published posthumously. Impressed by what he calls a

[5] "The Social Structure of Values" (New York: Macmillan Company, 1950).

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 74.

[7] "The Socializing of Theoretical Economics," in *The Trend of Economics* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1924) p. 73.

[8] See Allan Gruchy, "Modern Economic Thought" (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1947) pp. 366–8.

[9] "Social Value" (Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1911) p. 181.

[10] "The Economics of Collective Action" (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950).

"negotiational theory of value" operative in legal and financial transactions, Commons regards the record of court decisions as a history of human volitions which might well serve as the foundation for a theory of value. It is Commons' contention that economists have been traditionally misled from the central problems in valuation by their imitation of the physical sciences.

A more adequate theory of valuation turns to the analysis of human purposes and the human will to action. Such a theory must reject a simple mechanical theory of causation; also it must look toward the future rather than the past. Finally, a theory of value, to be sufficient for the needs of modern action, must be relevant to collective action and conflicts of interest.[11]

A. B. Wolfe, formerly a sociologist and now one of the foremost American economists with deep social insight, has given much of his time in recent years to the study of values, having concluded his article in *The Trend of Economics*[12] with the following words:

The fundamentals of a functional welfare economics will include . . . a generally accepted, psychologically grounded, norm of welfare, and an evaluation of the various aspects of the present price system with reference to this final norm, or more directly, to the objective conditions which may be taken as indicative of the extent to which our economic organization is serving as a means to the final end of human living.

Wolfe's major concern is centered in the psychological and philosophical aspects of the intrinsic values of ultimate satisfactions experienced by individuals, as the basic criteria of human welfare broadly considered, and to his way of thinking social values are the instrumentalities for the achievement of these intrinsic values of individual experience.

C. E. Ayres, in contrast, resorts to a more strongly organic social interpretation of value.

Instead of seeking to explain organized behavior in terms of the virtues presumed to be inherent (or intrinsic) in supposedly elemental acts or experiences, recent inquiry has recognized organized behavior as the universe of discourse in which the material under examination is the organizational process. . . . So considered, all values arise in and have reference to the pattern of organized behavior. What we mean by value is the bearing of any act, experience, thing or condition experienced, upon other such acts, experiences, or things in the continuum and concert of social life. To say this is not to deny that values are related to desires and their satisfaction. It does mean that desires and their satisfaction are significant and meaningful—which is to say valuable—according to

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 150.

[12] "Functional Economics," *op. cit.*, p. 482.

their relation to the continuum and concert of experience, or civilization.[13] Ayres, whose value theory remains most distinctively Veblenian, ascribes the origin of values to the life-process which he regards as a tool-using way of life, and then asks, "Can we adjust ourselves to the realization that all values arise in the tool-organized pattern, or economy, of human life?"

This brief sketch of some of the ideas of value expressed by a few American economists, most of whom are identified with the Institutionalist school of thought, is not meant to convey the impression that all of the Institutionalists are equally concerned with the development of a theory of value. Neo-Veblenians, Institutionalists, and Welfare economists share a common intellectual orientation generally opposed to the orthodox tradition of classical economic theory, with a decided empiricist tendency that attends strictly to facts. While united in their recognition of the decisive impact of institutional factors upon individual economic behavior and generally committed to a "holistic" approach to the study of economic phenomena, they differ as to the manner or extent in which the course of socio-economic evolution can be directed toward the realization of social goals of human welfare.

Among the most able economists of this group, several, including F. C. Mills, Wesley C. Mitchell, R. F. Hoxie, and Walton Hamilton, became so absorbed in detailed statistical, functional, and legal analysis that their outstanding abilities were not available for the systematic reformulation of economic theory. Basic empirical and inductive accumulation of facts is of course necessary as the foundation for a reconstruction of economic theory, but the collection of statistical data and empirical observations, alone, is not enough; the facts must be explained in terms of systematic theory. When these strict empiricists do seek for theoretical explanations for their accumulated data, they usually have recourse to the biological, psychological, and technological factors in the background of economic activities rather than the human aspirations, values, and social goals in the foreground of economic planning. These "backgrounds" and "foregrounds" of economic activity are interrelated, of course, and the neglect of either detracts from a realistic theoretical explanation. The sound inductive contributions and social insights of the Institutional economists have been largely dissipated in monographic and unco-ordinated fragments because of this strong positivistic bias against systematic theory, and the resulting lack of central organizing concepts.

In view of the newly developing *Weltanschauung* in which revolutionary interscientific and philosophical findings are pointing with renewed

[13] "Value—A Co-operative Inquiry," pp. 44–6.

emphasis to the importance of a scientific account of values, an excellent opportunity is at hand for the Institutional economists to develop a theory of value around which a systematic theory of institutional economics can be constructed. In doing so, they could make use of the works of Knies, Schmoller, Sombart and the Historicists as well as the outstanding contributions of Durkheim, Pareto, Cooley, and Weber, who, like the American Institutionalists, have reacted against the empirical inadequacy of the classical tradition in economic theory, but have gone beyond most Institutionalists in correcting these orthodox inadequacies by proceeding to the investigation of the social values operative in institutional life. The orthodox economic theory has neglected the theory of value; the heterodox economists seriously concerned with a reconstruction of economic theory can hardly afford to imitate this neglect of one of the most important elements in human relations—perhaps the focal formative influence in the institutional structure and functions of economic society.

IV

As an organizing concept, not only for a theory of social economy, but for the several social sciences, with ramifications that extend downward into the levels of the physical and biological sciences and upward into the wider reaches of social psychology, sociology, and philosophy, value can be seen as a fundamental term with significant generalizing possibilities, especially when endowed with empirical content, as the functional constituent of the norms of human welfare. In order to generalize intelligibly in any science or group of interrelated sciences for purposes of explanation, prediction, and planning, some such standard unit, common denominator, or referrent is required. The psychological processes of valuation and the broader interpretation of the consequences of alternative choices in terms of social value are factors of common concern in all of the social sciences; whether a particular social science be considered normative (evaluational) or merely concerned with facts, as such, the selection of its material and the development of its organization necessitate a working relationship with values.

The theory of value, then, might well provide the basic functional concepts for a practical co-ordination of the social sciences. Moreover, if a naturalistic theory of value is formulated, the dualistic gulf between the "natural" sciences and the social sciences and "humanities" will be bridged. Value theory not only opens possibilities of inter-scientific co-ordination, but a vital philosophy of science and a reunion of economics and ethics. There is a growing conviction—evidenced by increasing interdepartmental

co-operation—among scientists working in various sectors of scientific inquiry, that common human values, as the basis of vital choices, preferences, and value judgments, are as central in the development of a practical science of human relations as concepts like matter or energy in the classical formulations of physical science.

The advancement of science into the realms of value once reserved for a transcendental idealism opens new opportunities for a more purposive science of human relations. Objective, scientific standards are in the making which will enable men to better evaluate and direct the management of resources and industrial operations of an economic system in accordance with a more deliberate creation of values, economic and otherwise; for society creates values. As economists and other social scientists become better acquainted with the empirical ingredients of human welfare and healthy social development they will become more inclined to reckon with the category of value—and especially social values—in their investigations and theorizing.

As the criteria of constructive group behavior, the tests of creative life, and the value-constituents of human ideals and social goals come to be studied more thoroughly and become more widely understood, the emphasis in the social sciences is apt to shift from structure to function, from the static to the dynamic, from the fixed to the evolutionary, from facts to interpretations, from operations to consequences, from drift to planning, and from wealth to welfare. It may then be realized that real liberty is not only a matter of opportunity among immediately available opportunities, but a matter of providing valuable alternatives and the ways and means to intelligent choice and selection. Then, too, it may be realized that the purpose of economics, or any other science, is to serve the creative art of living, and that, in the words of Ruskin, "There is no wealth but life."

With spatio-temporal limitations in view, this theoretical essay has been necessarily conjectural to a large degree, and examples and evidence have been omitted in the interest of a comprehensive treatment of the subject. But conjecture and hypotheses have their place in scientific development, and if these highly synthetic ideas (and I hope they have not reached the heights of nebulosity) turn out to be thought-provoking—and not just provoking—the shame that hovers around my strongly positivistic "soul" may be partially dispelled.

Much hard work is in prospect for those scientists who venture into the field of values. It is perhaps the most difficult area of human investigation. Many of the terms used in this paper—including *value*—

require a searching functional analysis engaging the best available talent from several scientific disciplines in order that the empirical *content* of these concepts can be determined and the human *consequences* of their influence recognized. The task is colossal, but the probable result of its continued neglect might be most devastating. In fact, some of our present devastation may be due to its neglect.

By way of summary, it appears most probable that increasing scientific attention to values, by generating inter-scientific research and inter-disciplinary co-operation in theoretical formulations, should enrich and broaden the interrelated and pluralistic elements of empirical knowledge and give impetus to existing intellectual trends toward an organic integration of the sciences. No single science can give a sufficiently complete theoretical explanation of a manifold concept like value in terms of its concrete, experiential content. A synthesis of the findings and principles of several sciences is essential for a workable understanding of values—or any other significant problem of human relations, for that matter.

The co-operative inter-scientific study of values, consequently, should reduce the futile aspects of over-specialization in some fields of detached investigation and supplement specialized analytical work with a value-centered synthesis with practical applications. By crossing departmental lines freely, the quest for values should bridge the divisive forms of rationalistic dualism and bring about a wiser reunion of philosophy and science, moral philosophy and social theory, ethics and economics and thus relieve the neurotic tensions of our schizophrenic modern society.

The growing common interest of philosophical naturalists and transcendental idealists, materialists and mystics, positivists and romanticists in the theory of value should provide some ray of hope that antagonistic philosophical schools of thought will emerge from the fog of pedantic quibbling and approach common ground in the category of value.

By allowing their attention to converge upon values, scientists from every field of investigation should become more conscious (and ethically responsible) for the use and consequences of their work in society. As Norman Wiener once said, "If to be a scientist is to be less than a full man, I see no reason for any man ever to become a scientist." Moreover, to the extent that scientists can anticipate or foresee, by evaluation, the human and social consequences of their work, to that extent we can be more certain that scientific progress and technology will be more applicable to the enrichment of life than to its destruction.

The social sciences, particularly, are in need of a workable theory of value, and to them, mainly, we must look for its development. There is

little use in being able to tell "how" social or economic processes operate, unless we can also tell "*how well*" they operate. Even "efficiency" cannot be judged without reference to purpose and function, socially, culturally and ethically considered. A man may operate as efficiently as a racketeer as a member of the Intelligence Department of the United States Government, but his worth and legal status are judged with reference to the broader purposes and norms of social interest.

Prof. F. S. C. Northrup of Yale has repeatedly urged the abandonment of ethical neutrality by science and a serious scientific concern with values in order that science may be allied with democracy to promote the institutional arrangements which render freedom of inquiry secure. He stresses the need for the development of a "a core of human values to which all valuation as to policy and institutional development can be related."

By increased knowledge of the functional and consequential elements of values, as the objects of choice and public policy, and as the constituents of social goals, practical improvements can be made in the handling of industrial, social, and governmental problems; by such means, an applied social and economic science might be developed which would close the gulf between the academic world and the world of "practical" affairs.

With particular reference to the social sciences, a multilateral or social theory of value, conforming more closely to the problematic situations and needs of modern society, should supplement, if it does not completely supplant, the traditional self-centered orthodox theories that are representative of a bygone day of prevalent competition before the industrial integration of the machine age rendered the price system obsolete as an adequate regulator of economic activity.

The Institutional economists, Welfare economists, Historicists, and other heterodox schools of economic thought, especially, should be in search of a theory of value which will serve as an organizing concept for a systematic theory of socio-economic reconstruction and economic planning.

Above all, and finally, a clear and dynamic theory of social values should facilitate the conscious creation of human values by society through an intelligent institutional promotion and protection of the tested and emergent values of social progress. It is only through a clearer understanding of the referrents of value that men through collective democratic action can evaluate the performance of their own institutions, sponsor wise institutional reforms and public policies, and plan the management of their system of social economy in the expanding interests of human welfare.

Columbia University

Philanthropy and Peace

By Richard Claughton

Two contrary laws seem to be wrestling with each other nowadays: the one, a law of blood and death, ever imagining new means of destruction and forcing nations to be constantly ready for the battlefield —the other, a law of peace, work and health, ever evolving new means of delivering man from the scourges that beset him.

Pasteur

Funds for Education

The schemes for the betterment of mankind, devised by philanthropists, "gang aft a-gley," and the purposes for which they were intended seldom reach and, in some cases, do not approach the goal in view of the donor. Few altruists live to see the work of the institutions organized for the administration of their bequests, but those who have known their wishes and desires, and who have been associated with many chosen to carry them out, know that the wisest of trustees have different notions of how the funds should be administered and distributed.

For a century, at least, hundreds of millions of pounds and dollars have been left by wealthy men and women for education, in science, the humanities, and the arts. Nay, longer indeed, for Robert Boyle, more than 250 years ago, left money for the education of American Indians, and the building erected for that purpose still stands on the campus of William and Mary College at Williamsburg.

In this article it is unnecessary to deal with the endowments of colleges during the Middle Ages, for the history of these is extant. Anyway, most of the colleges before the Reformation received grants in land or rents from land, and those who administered the trusts and spent the revenues, on the purposes set down in the deed, were teacher-scholars identified with the institution. That was very different, indeed, from the methods that obtain today, with regard to the huge fortunes left by philanthropists for specific purposes.

It is a problem that is assuming such unwieldy proportions in our time that it would do no harm if trustees could be induced to read such a work as that of Sir Charles Mallet on "A History of the University of Oxford." Of course, the colleges of the great universities, which had their founda-

tions laid hundreds of years ago, have grown to almost unrecognizable limits, and what was a meek and lowly beginning has become, in many cases, a proud and grandiose enterprise, owing largely to the increased value of the original bequests in land.

Years ago claimants thought in hundreds of pounds or thousands of dollars. Now they cry for millions. But no one seems to consider whether philanthropy gets as much in result for the latter as it did for the former. It is a stupendous job nowadays, owing to the plethora of subjects, to put a student through a college or university course, and it may be supposed that if Mark Pattison, Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, were alive today, he would be amazed at the expense that is lavished upon so many illiterates and so few worthy scholars.

Alas, we have no philanthropists of the order of Alfred and Charlemagne. Asser tells us of the Palace School:

> . . . Almost all the ealdormen, reeves, and thegns who had been illiterate from childhood took to their books, preferring to study laboriously the unaccustomed learning rather than to give up their posts.

It may be noted that the philanthropists of our day have been too busy making money to become students, and only a few of their trustees are qualified to decide spiritually and culturally on the worthiness of a claimant for assistance.

The money that has been wasted in this era of distributing great fortunes to eleemosynary organizations must come to a stupendous figure. This remark may be resented by the heads of colleges and universities, but results speak louder than annual statements. The two chief purposes (apart from the exact sciences and medicine) for which philanthropists have given millions are peace and education. Even Alfred Nobel, a man who made his fortune manufacturing explosives, left money for a peace prize. And, so far as individuals are concerned, only four or five were worthy recipients. It is only necessary to mention the names of two of them—Sir William Cremer and Jane Addams—to estimate the worthiness of the politicians who gained it.

Peace Movements

LOOKING AT THE MATTER entirely from the standpoint of results, that is, how far trustees have been successful in achieving the aims of the donors, we have only to remind ourselves that western civilization has suffered from at least twelve major wars and many of lesser dimension during the past century. Indeed, two of the most devastating slaughterings of men

have taken place in the twentieth century—one since Andrew Carnegie passed away, and the other in the last years of his life.

Now think of all the money that has been spent on the endeavors of pacifists, and, while you are about it, consider how many of the trustees of philanthropic organizations regard men of peace. Of course, like Jeremiah, we might say of a good many people today that they cry

> . . . Peace, peace; when there is no peace. Were they ashamed when they had committed abomination? nay, they were not at all ashamed, neither could they blush. . . .

This writer has been associated with some of the active peace movements since the beginning of the century and deems himself qualified to estimate the value of the work performed by them. The best that can be said of any of their endeavors is that they have a certain influence during days of peace but, when the bugle sounds, the organizations dissipate speedily. Only a few individuals dare to stick to their principles once the guns begin to go off, and not a few of these are looked upon by the authorities as dangerous individuals. They are libeled and smirched by the minions of the sensational press, and some, for asserting their principles while the strife is in progress, are sent to prison.

During World War I, a philanthropist hired a ship and took a company of his friends from America to Europe, with the object of getting the men out of the trenches. He was ridiculed by Tom, Dick and Harry in mufti, but his name will never be forgotton by the common soldiers in whose interest he planned the expedition. "It was one of the bravest of all the absurd things a sincere man ever did," was the commentary of a well-known British soldier.

One of the tests of estimating the value of the work done by peace organizations is that of the Hague Tribunal. We all know the purpose for which it was established, but few have taken the trouble to learn how ineffectual it has been as an arbitration court to decide the merits of a dispute among nations. The reason why it has not succeeded in keeping the peace should be plain to anyone who has studied the causes of wars. It is not until the time is past for deliberation that the court is thought of as a means of determining the issue. Once the military and naval forces are on the move, it is too late for the tribunals such as the Hague to deal with the case.

Moreover, there has not been a nation that has dared present its case to a public body, once a war scare starts. Lloyd George himself gave the reason why it is impossible to do this. He said:

Wars are precipitated by motives which the statesmen responsible for them dare not assert. A public discussion would drag these motives in their nudity into the open, where they would die of exposure to the withering contempt of humanity.

He might have added that very few men in the cabinets of governments know more than the veriest newspaper reader of the reasons for the strife.

So far, the peace movements that have been set in motion since the time of the Cuban and Boer Wars have done their work in the intervals between the order to cease fire and the trumpet call to begin again. They have been intermittent, spasmodic, emotional, and nearly always patriotic, in the mere nationalistic sense.

It should be clear to a thoughtful person that no peace movement can carry through with any hope of success, unless its sponsors determine its work shall be permanent and not cease, no matter what war is taking place. This seems to be an utterly impractical proposal, but it has been made over and over again. It was the idea of Sir William Cremer. The names of the men and women who implicitly believed in it would make a long list, but it is only necessary to name such advocates as Renan, Tolstoy, and Victor Hugo. No leading politician's name would find a place in that list.

The Far-reaching Effects of Propaganda

PERHAPS ONE OF THE GREATEST difficulties which affect the endeavors of peace societies, and those individuals who abhor war, is the government-inspired propaganda especially disseminated for the sole purpose of covering up th. real causes of the friction. This was particularly noticeable in the few weeks after the murder at Sarajevo and the beginning of hostilities in 1914. To save the reputation of those who blundered into that world tragedy, it was necessary to hammer into the minds of the electors that Germany was solely responsible for the outbreak. There was no truth in this allegation, as we now know, and though it served its purpose during the war, it created a hatred and vindictiveness that made the punitive Treaty of Versailles the most pernicious stumbling block that was ever placed in the road to peace.

There is a large library of volumes written since the year 1919, many of them by authors of independent judgment, untainted by mere nationalistic prejudice, which clearly reveal the insensate propaganda and the deliberate mendacity of statesmen, editors, and prelates. The nefarious, the sordid history of these propaganda campaigns, waged to delude the electors of the various States, is available for anyone to read, who is interested in the great problems of war and peace. Even so mild and cautious a writer as J. A. Hobson denounced it in the following terms:

. . . The related arts of skilled mendacity and facile credulity were a new revelation of human faculties. Most of this work was done by politicians, journalists and other literary gentlemen who deemed it to be their patriotic duty to suspend the ordinary canons of truth in the interests of victory, and to allow their inventive imagination a license fitted to the needs of the situation.

There are two works upon this matter that students may find in the libraries: "England's Holy War," by Irene Cooper Willis, and "Words That Won the War," by James R. Mock and Cedric Larson. Many others might be consulted, but the two mentioned reveal the nature and conduct of the propaganda of the First World War in a glaring light.

Not a few thoughtful leaders of opinion in the countries that participated in the strife have stated in unmistakable terms that the problem of establishing a peace, that is not merely an interruption of war, is impossible under present political conditions. It is far too complicated by a thousand and one subsidiary matters for the general public to understand how those who work behind the scenes impose their will upon the politicians and influence the policies of leading statesmen. Who can read Dr. Tansill's illuminating volume, "America Goes to War," and remain indifferent to the machinations of the warmongers? If the works upon these problems were read and understood by the taxpayers, there would be no need for peace societies.

But who is so sanguine as to look for the day when the colleges and universities will give us a generation competent enough to deal with the mighty problems that keep the world in a state of war even when no military battle is taking place, for the moment?

Is there one organization that has been devised for the keeping of the peace, which has a single success to its credit? The story of the work that was done at Geneva by the League of Nations is recorded in many volumes. When Germany was defeated in November, 1918, there were millions of people in all the countries of Europe who imagined that the cessation of hostilities meant that an opportunity had come to the people, a chance to secure a peace that would not lead to another war. How was it, then, that a treaty was imposed upon Germany that made peace impossible? Two of the three great statesmen who were responsible for it have told us why this object was not obtained. Both Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson stated clearly that it was the campaigns of hate during the struggle that made it utterly impossible to deal justly with the foe. Every pledge at the armistice, based upon Wilson's Fourteen Points, was broken by the Allies.

A book written by one who was intimately concerned in the making of the peace is called "The Wreck of Europe." The author of it was Francesco Nitti, the Prime Minister of Italy. He tells us:

> . . . It will remain forever a terrible precedent in modern history that, against all pledges, all precedents and all traditions, the representatives of Germany were never even heard; nothing was left to them but to sign a treaty at a moment when famine and exhaustion and threat of revolution made it impossible not to sign it. . . .
>
> I believe that Europe is threatened with decadence more owing to the Peace Treaties than as a result of the war. She is in a state of daily increasing decline, and the causes of dissatisfaction are growing apace.

Nitti was not only a sagacious critic, but, at the same time, an unusual prophet. The consequences of the attempt to carry out the provisions of the Treaty were as disastrous over a period of years as the war that gave it birth. Instead of its bringing to the people a semblance of peace, it brought penury and destitution.

America suffered from two great depressions, and these affected the finance and commerce of every State in the world. It did not even bring a show of polite harmony among the victorious Allies. France considered that she was deserted by England after the war. Clemenceau told Lloyd George that the relations between the two countries were embittered, and General Huguet, who had been French Military Attaché in London, makes the following terrible declaration in his book, "Britain and the War".

> We were mistaken, in 1919, in the character of our adversaries, since in the peace we accorded them a treaty whose only result has been to allow them to deny their defeat, to escape from its consequences, and to develop in their hearts new feelings of hate, with openly-proclaimed hopes of revenge.
>
> We were mistaken at the same time also in the character of our Allies, when we believed in the permanence of feelings which were and could only be fleeting, and when we sacrificed our interests and our security for vain promises, which have never been realised and which never will be.

The Failure of the League of Nations

ALL THE HOPES based upon the imaginary effectiveness of the League of Nations as an instrument of keeping the peace came to nothing. The student has only to read the story of the petitions sent to the League by the minorities in Czechoslovakia and Poland for the redress of grievances to judge the value of its work.

The petitions began to pour into the Hall of Peace at Geneva as early as June, 1920, and year after year the distressed minorities sent petition

after petition without avail. Professor Stephen Roberts, in his work, "The House that Hitler Built," says that the Germans of Czechoslovakia, "in their resentment launched nineteen petitions before the League of Nations in six years but without much result."

The League of Nations was, in many respects, responsible for fomenting the causes of strife which led to the Second World War, by delaying, year after year, consideration of the grievances of the minorities. Yet, the delegates to Geneva and the membership of the Secretariat were men chosen from the higher ranks of commerce, finance, and learning. Presumably most of them were university men. How strange that, with all the wealth of intellectual persons to control and guide affairs, they failed signally to save Europe from another World War!

One of the reasons for this discreditable result of the efforts of the delegates was given by Arthur Henderson. He said that there was a constant conflict of opinion and ideas, and that usually on important matters the conflict of particular national interests prevented progress being made. Are not the proceedings at Lake Success a repetition of what took place at Geneva?

Education and Peace

IT IS AMAZING to find that there are people today, after all these terrible lessons, who think that peace is a problem that can be solved by politicians, who believe that national interests are of paramount importance. Some of the philanthropists who have made large bequests to be administered by trustees have had an idea that education, in the proper sense of the term, should be used by colleges and universities as a channel to the peace goal. It is an ideal worthy of the highest respect among cultured people, but in the practice of everyday affairs, it is a notion that is utterly alien to those who gather on the campus. Results tell the real story of this matter. The people of the earth are farther away from peace, after all the work done in the colleges and universities, than they were a hundred years ago, when these institutions were used only for the purposes of learning, and not for teaching a numbskull how to make a living.

We might ask whether our method of educating middle-class youths is as sound and practical as that in vogue fifty years ago. No one, then, thought of a school—much less a college—as a place where a lad would receive vocational training and be taught to make a living. It seemed to those in charge of education that it was sufficient to make the rudiments of learning available to a poor lad. The common schools taught grammar, geography, and history, and the commercial schools provided tuition for

bookkeeping, shorthand, accounting, French, and Latin. A high percentage of lads, when they reached the age of sixteen, became apprentices in skilled trades and spent five years learning in the shops before they were qualified journeymen.

Many of the youths, during the period, took advantage of night schools where they added further knowledge to the store gathered in the common school and in the practical work of the shop. Most of the boys, after the elementary tuition, started work at the age of twelve or fourteen, and this group provided Great Britain and the United States with many of the inventors, manufacturers, and engineers whose names are inscribed upon the honor rolls of commerce and finance.

A sillier fallacy never haunted the mind than that of imagining a university can educate a man. All it can do, at best, is to provide the means for a youth to make a cultural being of himself. But if he were inclined to know the best that has been thought and said, he could set to work in any fully stocked library without the aid of teachers. Thousands do this generation after generation.

The author of the "Private Papers of Henry Ryecroft" was an exceptionally fine judge of cultural and social affairs, and he lived in the period when national schools were started. George Gissing knew bitter poverty and all the vicissitudes of the poor. He was a classical scholar, and a distinguished novelist. Here, in our country, he tried to make a living by teaching. Shortly before his death he wrote:

Education is a thing of which only the few are capable; teach as you will, only a small percentage will profit by your most zealous energy.

No wonder Ruskin said that the best education is the one you get for yourself.

If our men and women interested in higher education would inform themselves of the thought of those who gave their minds to this subject years ago, they would learn that culture and education are twin aims. Shades of Matthew Arnold, Ernest Renan, Emerson, and Carlyle. What a difference now! Education: two world wars! Culture: hate and destruction! Is it not time to take soundings?

Who can study the statistics annually reported by Mr. Hoover of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and remain oblivious of the terrible condition that prevails among the young people of our country. Recently we have had federal investigations of gangsters, politicians, soldiers and sailors, and they reveal a state of affairs which point directly at the weakness of our system of education. But those who are chiefly concerned in the direction of the work of our colleges and universities have so far not raised a voice of denunciation that this writer has heard.

At a recent meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a learned professor read a paper in which he declared: "The primary task of every society is to civilize the thousands of young barbarians born into it each day." He might have added that it was time our colleges and universities ceased attempting to "educate" them and made an effort to control them under such a system as that of the Borstal, or some other severe method. Presidents and trustees of colleges and universities might read the article in *The Encyclopaedia Britannica* on Juvenile Offenders, and learn what might be done to civilize barbarians. The records show clearly that every innovation made for the purpose of giving children more liberty (license) in the home and in the school has gone far to increase the number of illiterates and delinquents.

The real test to be applied to the cultural and social value of the work of our establishments of learning is the effectiveness of the students, when they enter the workaday world, to bring about conditions of life that are worthy of respect. This reads like a hoary platitude, but who will quarrel with the truth it contains?

A president of a university said that his experience of twenty years had taught him that not twenty-five per cent of the pupils under his direction were interested in the majority of their studies. It does seem strange that, after all the work that was expended upon such courses as economics, history, political science, international relations, etc., the graduates as a body did little or nothing to help avert a Second World War.

The Teaching of History

NOW SOMETHING has gone fundamentally wrong with education. If the universities have failed in making men under their direction desire peace and believe that it is more important than football and basketball, then it is time philanthropists thought of other ways of distributing money for the purpose of educating people to live in harmony with their neighbors.

In the teaching of history, colleges and universities could do a great deal to help the cause of peace. Unfortunately many works used in these institutions do not go very deeply into the real causes of strife among nations. To say that some of them are prejudiced is to condemn them mildly. We need another Mabillon to expose the superficiality of some of them and the absence of hinterland knowledge on the part of the authors. Protests without number have been made against many works that are current and that will serve no other interest than to preserve the propaganda notions that have been disseminated by broadcasters, with the consent of governments.

Surely if there be one signal value of history, it is that it should make the past live so that we may understand our present condition and be warned as to what the future may hold in store for us. Who can read Thucydides and Polybius and fail to learn the lesson their chapters reveal? The imperial disasters of Athens are not unlike those of Great Britain, and yet many of our country's exploiters today brook the authority of experience and would perpetrate the same adventures in the Near and Far East that have caused such intense bitterness within the British Empire. The exploitation of lands beyond the sea, for the purpose of using their natural resources and the low-paid labor of the natives, is a crime for which we shall pay dearly. It is only necessary to mention what took place in the State of Morocco when France and Spain partitioned that country at the behest of such predaceous organizations as the Unions des Mines and the Comité du Maroc.

Where will you find a history in a university library that tells the true story of the expansion of European empires? To do this work we need men of the impartiality of mind of a Sir Maurice Powicke and those who contributed the articles to the *Cambridge Medieval History*. They were all scholarly historians and realized that the past made the present possible. Many philosophers during the last hundred years have told us in the clearest terms what they think of much that goes by the name of history. Lord Acton and the men who gathered about him at Cambridge denounced much of it as spurious. Before Acton, Schopenhauer had said:

> Besides this incompleteness of history there is the fact that Clio, the Muse of History, is as permeated with lies as a street-whore with syphilis. The new, or critical, historical research goes to considerable trouble indeed to cure her, but with its local remedies it can only deal with individual symptoms that break out here and there—and not a little quackery, too, finds its way into the process, which makes matters worse than ever.

How are we to expect the boys who are being "educated" to become men who desire peace, if the truth of the wars of this century be withheld from them by their instructors? Surely education ought to be the handmaiden of peace, and through knowledge draw all people to worship at her shrine.

To preach the Tolstoyan doctrine of peace without force would be an ideal way of meeting the wishes of some of the philanthropists who have made great bequests to universities, religious and charitable institutions, for the purpose of practicing the basic Christian principles. To do this effectively it would be necessary to unfold the real, the true history of the causes of wars. Now no body of practical men, as we understand them

today, would consider it patriotic to support such a scheme. It is safe to say this without fear of contradiction, for it is alleged, on excellent authority, that a certain foundation has provided funds to pay for the writing and publication of a nationalistic history of the late war, a task that is unworthy of men connected with an institution of learning, and one that will meet the well-merited scorn of those who today are working upon a non-nationalistic, unprejudiced review of all the political jealousies and frictions that began in 1897 with the Hays secret treaty with Great Britain, unwritten but nevertheless binding.

Before the politicians and their servitors can make progress with international combinations against a probable enemy State, it will be necessary to clear the air of all the propaganda yarns that have instilled hate in the minds of the people. Before the one-worlders can bring about the cooperation of States east and west, it will be necessary for the people to cleanse their own hearts and realize that force has never yet brought peace to the people.

New York

André Gide

ANDRÉ GIDE is dead. Shortly before he passed away, he wrote a short article for *Picture Post* (London). In it he declared that his creed was: "Each is more valuable than all." Perhaps no man who has lived during this period, since the Franco-Prussian War, has suffered so much as he from the arid controversies of rationalism and the turmoils of political vagaries. How such a man could even flirt with the proposals and conceptions of Socialism and think they could possibly benefit the individual is something that even his devoted admirers cannot explain. There is a sure test—indeed, an acid test—in this that should be applied by reasonable people, and, to put it in the form of a question, it is: How can an individualist place his faith in any political form of the State?

Gide makes no answer to this, although he admits that the shibboleth of Communism has been shattered by the experiment in Russia.

At the end of his long life, after all the strange twists and turns of his thought, he declares boldly for individualism, and he renews his faith in the generations to come, that what man has achieved will be surpassed by his heirs. Such has been the experience of a thinker who had no faith in religion, a term he never precisely defined. Indeed, I gathered that his notion of it was expressed merely by the word "churchianity."

He did not go deeply into this. In all probability, such an idea as that expressed by Jesus, "The Kingdom of God is within you," would mean

very little to Gide, although it is the very core of the individualism that he now advocates.

In the *Picture Post* article he says:

> We have seen the fatal results of this renunciation of individuality and how intoxicating were the effects on young minds, anxious to serve and to respond with devotion to this crafty solicitation to resign all personality and to—let us be bold enough to say it—give way to laziness; whilst the individual, desirous of being and remaining himself, is, and must keep, alone.

I have no doubt that this statement will shock the Gide devotees as much as it will disturb the one-worlders and the planners who are drawing blueprints of a utopia for sinful man.

He is not afraid to make it known that he is a rebel. He says:

> We, the rebellious, our forces are scattered—a network, sparsely spread over the whole of our old world, threatened on all sides and apparently doomed. But we must rest convinced, as did the first Christian martyrs, crushed as they were, that in our very defeat we shall triumph.

Nevertheless, despite the philosophical wanderings of a mind always overcharged, it is refreshing at this time of day, to have one speak who is not afraid to raise his voice. Yet, it is a poor lookout for the man who desires to be an individual and to keep his spirit free from the nostrums that would injure it.

R. C.

New York

> *Those countries,.....by sweeping away small homesteads and laying ten farms into one, literally stripped of all shelter the laborer. A farmer, in such cases, has a whole domain in his hands, and this not only to the manifest injury of the public at large, but in open violation of positive law. The poor forger is hanged; but where is the prosecutor of the monopolizing farmer, though the law is as clear in the one case as in the other? But it required this infernal system to render every wholesome regulation nugatory; and to reduce to such abject misery a people famed in all ages for the goodness of their food and their dress.*
>
> WILLIAM COBBETT [1821]

George's Remedies for Britain's Land Problems

By ELWOOD P. LAWRENCE

WHEN HENRY GEORGE sailed for Great Britain in 1881, no one could have prophesied the far reaching consequences of his act. Within two years both he and his book, *Progress and Poverty,* were to become household words in Great Britain. Within a decade he was to be known as the greatest single influence in arousing the British workingman to a consciousness of his economic position in society and of his deserts.

How can we account for this heroic achievement? It is true that George was aided in his accomplishment by circumstances outside his control. In 1881 conditions in Great Britain were ripe for an attack on vested interests. The British working class was suffering from the effects of a prolonged economic depression. Irish agricultural laborers were burning and killing in protest against starvation conditions and the land laws. In the north of Scotland the crofters were virtually enslaved to the landlords.

It is also true that George's arrest by the Irish constabulary in August, 1882, while he was observing conditions in the west of Ireland, and the questions subsequently asked in the House of Commons about this affair, gave him a publicity far beyond the effect of his book or speeches at this date. Finally the three and one-half column review of *Progress and Poverty* in the London *Times* in September, 1882, put the seal of legitimacy on his agitation.

But this is not the whole story, for if George had not been able to take advantage of the reputation he had gained by these circumstances, he would have been only a nine days' wonder. George's British reputation is the result both of the influence of *Progress and Poverty,* and his personal influence, exerted in more than a hundred speeches during his subsequent visits to Great Britain. The message in *Progress and Poverty* is there for anyone to read, but as yet no one has taken the trouble to find out the exact nature of the proposals for a reform of the land laws which George set forth to British audiences. The question is important, since it was through the give and take of the lecture platform and the report of these affairs in the British papers that George's views were propagated in Great Britain.

In his speeches George presented two main points: The social and economic condition of the British working man, and the remedy for his ills. In defining George's message to the British we may leave out of consideration for the present the first of these points. Most British papers acknowledged the plight of the working man in the Eighteen Eighties; what George contributed in this respect was a description of conditions in unusually specific and moving terms. He gave a local habitation and a name to the relationship between progress and poverty which he had set forth in his famous book.

The issue was joined over the second point—the remedy. What George had to say about his remedy for conditions in Great Britain can best be understood by noticing first what British papers thought he was advocating. Their conclusions are indicated by the following representative headlines concerning George's lectures:

"The Nationalization of the Land," London *Times*, September 6, 1882.
"Land Nationalization," London *Standard*, September 6, 1882.
"The Redoubtable Prophet of Land Nationalization," Glasgow *Herald*, January 28, 1884.
"Mr. George on his Crusade of Plunder," *Pall Mall Gazette*, March 18, 1884.
"Land Nationalization," *Justice*, October 11, 1884.
"The Georgite Confiscation," Dunfermline *Journal*, December 27, 1884.
"The Single Tax Fraud Again," *Justice*, October 11, 1888.
"Land Tax Only," London *Star*, March 11, 1889.
"Henry George and the Single Tax," *Commonweal*, June 1, 1889.

These headlines cover all five of George's visits to Great Britain. They reveal a remarkable agreement concerning his program: up to 1888 George was advocating land nationalization and confiscation, after this date he was promoting the single tax. It is also noteworthy that during George's first three visits to Great Britain not one newspaper headline mentioned tax or single tax in connection with George's program.

"An Old Socialist Theory"

NEWSPAPER COMMENTS on George's lecture campaigns show the same pattern, with the added belief that George's remedy was socialistic. In an editorial on George's first London speech and on the principles set forth in *Progress and Poverty* the writer declared: "from whatever side we approach the nationalization of land, it turns out, on examination, to be nothing more than an old Socialist theory, furbished up anew."[1] Another

[1] London *Times*, Sept. 6, 1882, p. 5.

journal pointed out that Mr. Herbert Gladstone's method of dealing with the Irish land question by confiscating rents was as "iniquitous as Mr. George's for confiscating land."[2] Mr. G. Barnet Smith, who called himself a "Liberal," wrote that "Mr. George's principles could only lead to socialism and communism of the worst kind."[3] This view was echoed by a Scottish writer: "Mr. Henry George and his followers are simply expounding familiar and exploded doctrines of Communism in a slightly disguised form."[4] A reviewer of *Social Problems* concluded that George was a collectivist and belonged in the same category as Fourier, Saint Simon, phalansteries, and Brook Farm.[5] In the opinion of most newspaper editors George was either a land nationalizer or a socialist, probably both. The most favorable view along these lines was the conclusion that his program was only slightly more dangerous than that of Alfred Russell Wallace. "Nationalization of the land is no newly broached theory, and if Mr. Henry George accentuates it by denying to landlords any right to compensation, he merely states the question on sharper lines than are approved by Mr. Russell Wallace."[6]

However, newspaper comments on George's land agitation during his first three visits also reveal an awareness that his program was one of taxation, though even in these cases the term "single tax" is not used. Ethnologists may find significance in the fact that it was only Scottish papers that pointed out the taxation feature of the American's views. George, according to the Edinburgh *Evening News*, was a visionary because he believed poverty could be abolished by taxing the land to its rental value.[7] And an editorial writer remarked scornfully of his talk to a Dundee audience on February 3, 1884, that "when the audience was told taxation on land which Mr. George proposes would enable people to run on the railways free, would pension widows, and secure dowries for girls, it laughed. . ."[8]

It is clear that up to the end of his third visit to Great Britain George's program was thought to be either out-and-out socialism or land nationalization plus confiscation. It was occasionally mentioned as an afterthought that the results aimed at were to be accomplished by taxation. But by the fall of 1888, George's program began to be identified by the term "single tax."

[2] *St. James Gazette*, Oct. 14, 1882, p. 4.
[3] London *Times*, Jan. 19, 1884, p. 10.
[4] *Scotsman*, Jan. 11, 1884, p. 5.
[5] "Mr. George's New Book," London *Daily News*, Jan. 24, 1884, p. 3.
[6] "Henry George on Social Problems," Aberdeen *Herald*, Feb. 23, 1884, p. 5.
[7] Edinburgh *Evening News*, Jan. 10, 1884, p. 2.
[8] "Mr. George's Socialism," Dundee *Courier and Argus*, Feb. 4, 1884, p. 2.

It was at this time that William Jameson, Honorary Secretary of the Land Nationalization Association, pointed up this new emphasis in George's propaganda. On the occasion of George's fourth visit he wrote to the London *Star:* "I would fain say nothing to suggest a jarring note in the welcome which all sorts and conditions of land nationalizers greet his return to our shores." But he added the charge that the *Star* seemed to have "definitely adopted Mr. George's plan of taxation of rent in preference to land nationalization."[9] During the following month Jameson returned to this theme. He praised George's exposure of "the inherent evils of landlordism," but he dissented from his belief that only through taxation could "we secure salvation from the evils of landlordism."[10]

Yet despite the distinction between the single tax and nationalization, as pointed out by Jameson, and despite the use of "single tax" to identify George's program, the conviction that George was a nationalizer persisted. Although the *Star,* founded in 1888, supported George up to the hilt and printed many stories on the single tax, it continued to use the term "nationalization" with reference to George. For instance, a report of George's Lambeth speech contained the statement: "The nationalization of the land does not mean the division of the land among all people—in fact Mr. George does not call himself a 'land nationalizer' but a single tax man."[11] The operative word is "call"; the statement suggests that to the reporter "single tax" means nationalization without a literal division of land.

The same view was maintained at the end of George's fifth visit by the Irish *Times.* George spoke in Dublin on July 13, 1889; he emphasized throughout his speech the function of taxation in his scheme; yet the newspaper account began with the statement: "Mr. George delivered a lecture on Saturday evening last in the Round Room, Rotunda, on 'Land Nationalization.' "[12] On the same day an editorial comment was headed "The Land Nationalization of Henry George," and in the body of the editorial it was maintained that George had expounded his "single tax principle, or land nationalization."[13] Two days later the same paper referred to George's "single-tax theory" and argued that once the principle was applied the result would be 'Nationalization' because the State would in effect own the land.[14]

[9] "Taxation and Nationalization," London *Star,* Nov. 22, 1888, p. 4.
[10] "Land Taxation and Nationalization," London *Star,* Dec. 12, 1888, p. 4.
[11] "George in Lambeth," London *Star,* Nov. 28, 1888, p. 2.
[12] "Lecture by Mr. Henry George," Irish *Times,* July 15, 1889, p. 2.
[13] Irish *Times,* July 15, 1889, p. 5.
[14] Irish *Times,* July 17, 1889, p. 5.

George's Burr of Nationalization and Socialism

IT WOULD SEEM, then, that in spite of George's adoption of "single tax" as a designation for his remedy the burr of nationalization and socialism stuck to him throughout his British agitation. To what extent is this description of his program a true reflection of what George preached? The question can be answered by examining some of George's British speeches. It is easy to assume that George must have preached the single tax doctrine in Great Britain from the very beginning, and that the newspaper reports were mere distortions and misrepresentations of what he said. The truth is more complex and more interesting.

Before looking at the speeches it is necessary to point out that the popular British view of George's land program was partly the result of the company he kept. On March 19, 1882, he was one of several speakers at a Glasgow meeting at which the Scottish branch of the Democratic Federation (later known as the Social Democratic Federation), a socialist organization, was established. The socialist magazine *Justice*, founded in 1883, supported George consistently until 1886.[15]

George's first London address on September 5, 1882, was at the invitation of the Land Nationalization Association, and A. R. Wallace, the outstanding advocate of nationalization, was in the chair. Late in September, 1882, in a circular advertising a meeting in Hackney on "The Land Question," the Land Nationalization Association included the following recommendation: "Working men should read the masterly works, 'Progress and Poverty,' 6d., and 'The Irish Question,' 3d., by Henry George, in which the land is clearly shown to be the property of the whole people, and not of a few so-called land owners."[16] At the same time J. C. Durant was advertising his cheap editions of *Progress and Poverty* and *The Irish Land Question* as text books in land nationalization: "As the Land Nationalization movement is yet in its infancy, many of its leading advocates deem that at present it cannot be better promoted than by the dissemination of these clear and brilliant works."[17]

Finally, George made his second visit to England at the invitation and with the financial support of the Land Reform Union, an organization which included in its membership both socialists and land nationalizers. It was natural for the British to suppose that George was a nationalizer and a socialist because groups and individuals representing these ideas sponsored him and supported his agitation.

[15] George's relations with the socialists are developed more fully in a paper by the present writer to appear soon in this JOURNAL.

[16] *Henry George Collection*, New York Public Library.

[17] *Ibid.*

Nor did George's statements of his remedy for conditions in England explicitly contradict at all times and at all points this general impression. His speeches show that at the beginning he stated only general propositions, that he later made these propositions more specific, that he came to advocate a policy of gradual tax reform rather than an immediate confiscation of rent, and that he arrived at a full blown statement of the single tax principle only at the end of his British experience. At the same time George acknowledged that his proposal to tax land values was equivalent to nationalizing the land, and he always came at least half way to meet the socialists, much farther than most of them were willing to come in his direction.

During his first visit to Great Britain George was a correspondent for the New York *Irish World;* naturally in the speeches he made during this period he felt his way very carefully. To a Dublin audience on November 14, 1881, George did not mention any specific program for land reform, nor did he refer to nationalization or socialism by name. The gist of his remarks concerning a remedy for conditions in Great Britain was that the land belonged to the people by natural right and that any measure which fell short of bringing this result about, including the Parnell scheme of peasant proprietorship, was a palliative.[18]

Some Ambiguous Statements

IN JUNE OF 1882 George again spoke in Dublin, and this time he was more explicit about his program. "Land" he defined not only as agricultural land, but all land. "It meant the property in the land, in which every single one of the people had an equal share and right." He thought the true solution to the land question was to "give every man that which he fairly earned . . . It was merely necessary to take those profits coming from the land for the benefit of the whole people, which were not due to the exertions of the labourer or the use of the capital required."[19] Without further qualification these remarks could equally have been attributed to a land nationalizer, though a socialist would have balked at the reference to capital.

When he came to London for his first speech there, George made statements which were even more likely to give the impression that he was a nationalizer or a socialist. The meeting was under the auspices of the Land Nationalization Association. In introductory remarks J. A. Parker, secretary of the organization, spoke of George as "our very able coadjutor

[18] "Land and Labour," Irish *Times*, Nov. 15, 1881, p. 6.
[19] "Mr. Henry George's Lecture," Irish *Times*, July 12, 1882, p. 6.

in the main question." And the chairman, Wallace, stated that George favored "the abolition of private property in land."[20] George did not deny the first statement and the second had of course been set forth in *Progress and Poverty.*

In his speech George made no reference to taxation as a means of accomplishing the desired reforms. The closest he came to doing so was the declaration: "make the land free, and they would relieve industry of all taxation, obtain really free trade, and make great progress toward equality and true socialism."[21] It is, of course, obvious that "free trade" limits the meaning of "socialism" to something quite different from that of the Marxians, but it was a distinction which non-socialists might not readily grasp.

When it came to stating a remedy, George merely endorsed the program of the Land Nationalization Association, with the added proviso of no compensation. He said "this fight for the nationalization of the land was a world-wide fight. . . . He did not mean to say, however, that when they had accomplished nationalization of the land—when they had secured to every human being in the country his full and equal right to the land of the country they would have accomplished everything. . . . Unlike Michael Davitt, he was not prepared to give the landlords compensation in his scheme for nationalization of the land."[22]

Thus, at the time of his return to America in the fall of 1882, George was identified in the minds of the British public with the following doctrines: the land belonged by natural right to the people; people could secure this natural right by nationalization of the land; landlords should receive no compensation for their land; and a belief in the general concept of socialism.[23] George continued to maintain the first three of these doctrines in his subsequent visits to Great Britain; these, and not the tax proposal which he later elaborated, account for most of the attacks on his views in British papers. The title of one article—"Mr. George and his Crusade of Plunder"—epitomizes the reaction.[24] He was not and never had been a socialist in the doctrinaire meaning of the word. But he persisted in viewing with sympathy socialist efforts to improve the lot of the poor. And he recognized the possibility of the development of some form

[20] "The Nationalization of the Land," London *Times*, Sept. 6, 1882, p. 5.

[21] "Land Nationalization," London *Standard*, Sept. 6, 1882, p. 5 .

[22] "The Nationalization of the Land," London *Times*, Sept. 6, 1882, p. 5.

[23] Even today these propositions stated in the United States would be considered heretical. It is no wonder that in Great Britain they should have been regarded as sheer piracy.

[24] *Pall Mall Gazette*, March 18, 1884, p. 1.

of socialism sometime in the future. Moreover, socialism was associated in the public mind with the redistribution of wealth generally, with confiscation, and with nationalization. For these reasons, George continued to bear the name of socialist.

Not until his second visit to Great Britain at the invitation of the Land Reform Union, did George explicitly link taxation to his land reform scheme. In the London speech which opened his campaign he charged that the ancestors of the present landlords had obtained their land by throwing the taxes on the mass of the people. His plan "was simply to reverse the operation and tax them. (Cheers) That was the best way to raise the public revenue."[25]

George's Progression to Practical Measures

IN THE PORTION of his talk devoted to a remedy for the economic distress of the working class, George hammered away at his tax proposal. There were to be no more taxes on production, taxes would be "confined to the value of the land." He claimed that his proposal was of great importance "as a mere matter of fiscal change," but that it had advantages beyond this. It embraced social possibilities only dreamed of under the present economic system. Not only could the national expenses be paid out of the rent of the land, but there would remain an enormous surplus for the use of the nation. To skeptics who did not believe that the rent of the land would amount to the sum at present collected by taxation, George answered that they would have to change their definition of rent. "It was necessary to take more than the ground rent in making a calculation; that which the leaseholder got was, economically speaking, as much rent as that which the landlord got. The profit which the tenant got as much belonged to the nation as that which went to the landlord."[26]

This was at the beginning of George's second British visit. After addressing, according to his own figures, twenty-seven meetings in England and Scotland, he returned to London where he was interviewed by a representative of the *Pall Mall Gazette*. This interview brought out even more explicitly than his London speech the details of his tax program. George had now progressed from general details about taxation and land reform to practical measures for accomplishing his ends.

He predicted that one result of his agitation in Scotland would be seen in the Glasgow municipal elections in 1884. There would be a candidate in every ward running on "our" platform. "The object of this is to

[25] "Mr. George on Property in Land," London *Daily News*, Jan. 10, 1884, p. 6.
[26] *Ibid.*

demand local taxation of the feu duties, or as you would say in England, the rating of the ground rents." George admitted that they would not be able to "appropriate the whole of the landlords' income today, tomorrow, or even the day after. What we shall do is to begin by adopting the program of the Financial Reform Association. . . .That is to say, we will restore the land tax—4s. in the pound. . . . That is all we ask at present. . . . .When the battle is won we shall march in and conquer." " 'That is to say, Mr. George,' asked the reporter, 'after taxing them 20 per cent you will proceed to tax them 100 per cent of their incomes?' 'Precisely,' said Mr. George, 'precisely.' "[27]

Such a pronouncement not only placed George's views on the land question more clearly before his British listeners than had his earlier speeches; it also served to propitiate those who were unable to accept out and out confiscation. This result was apparently George's intention. In a similar interview during his third visit to Great Britain he pointed out that "The propagation of ideas is one thing, the carrying of those ideas into politics is another. . . .The resumption of the people's rights to the soil must be a gradual process which will injure no one."[28]

Thus by January 25, 1885, the end of his third visit to Great Britain, George had set forth clearly the essentials of his land program. The significant addition since his first London speech in 1882 had been the assertion that the land could be secured for its rightful owners, the people, by means of taxation, and that this taxation would be increased gradually and painlessly from 4s. in the pound to 100 per cent of the land value. The only subsequent change in this statement of George's land program was made during his third and fourth visits, when he put forward "single tax" as a designation for his scheme.

George himself emphasized that this represented a change in nomenclature only, not a change in his program. In June, 1889, the London *Star* reported him as finding it "curious" that some people should see in "the idea of a single tax" an indication that he had changed his viewpoint since last in Great Britain. George maintained that his position was exactly the same,[29] a view substantiated by the program we have already outlined from his earlier speeches.

It was nevertheless true that whereas before January 25, 1885, George

[27] "Mr. George on his Crusade of Plunder," *op. cit.*

[28] "Mr. Chamberlain Translated into Plain English," *Pall Mall Gazette*, Jan. 14, 1885, p. 1.

[29] George's remark indicates his recognition of the fact that to apply "single tax" to his views was to over-simplify them somewhat.

had not mentioned "single tax," he now consistently applied this term to his views and his program. One example, drawn from his address at Toomebridge, Ireland, on July 11, 1889, illustrates the final form in which he stated his doctrines to British audiences: "That is what we propose by what we call the single tax. We propose to abolish all taxes for revenue. In place of all the taxes which are now levied, to impose one single tax, and that a tax upon the value of the land. Mark me, upon the value of the land alone—not upon the value of the improvements, not upon the value of what the exercise of labour had done to make the land valuable, that belongs to the individual; but upon the value of the land itself, irrespective of the improvements, so that an acre of land that has not been improved will pay as much tax as an acre of land which has been improved."[30]

A "Socialist" by the Logic of Loose Thinking

THESE EXCERPTS from George's speeches show that although his earliest statements on the land question were exceedingly vague with regard to the nature of his proposals, he began to supply this deficiency in his London speech of January 9, 1884. From this point George increasingly emphasized his taxation principle until by December, 1888, he began to call it the single tax. Why, then, the persistent identification in British newspapers of George's program with nationalization and/or socialism?

The answer seems to be first, that the distinction between nationalization and George's program was so small as to be virtually invisible, the difference being between dividing the land and dividing the rent among the people. Second, George's views about property in land and the question of compensating landlords smacked of the kind of lawlessness which is popularly associated with socialism. By the logic of loose thinking George was therefore a socialist.

There is no doubt that George considered himself to be a land nationalizer within the legitimate meaning of that term, though he differed with Wallace's group as to the means of nationalizing land. Before his first trip to England the word had appeared in his vocabulary. He had written in *The Irish Land Question:* "To demand the nationalization of the land by the simple means I have proposed makes possible—nay, as the discussion goes on, makes inevitable—an irresistible combination, the combination of labor and capital against landlordism."[31]

We have already noticed how George in his first London speech supported land nationalization, and even went beyond the demands of the

[30] "The Land for the People," Henry George Foundation of Great Britain.

[31] Henry George, "The Land Question," New York, Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, 1941, p. 64. Published in 1881 as "The Irish Land Question."

nationalizers in refusing compensation for landlords. Henry Hyndman evidently accepted George as a nationalizer at this time. Before George's second visit, Hyndman wrote him: "I hear from Joynes that you are coming over here to lecture on Land Nationalization."[32]

Even after he had later introduced his tax proposal George continued to speak as though he were a nationalizer. To a Dublin audience on April 9, 1884, George linked his program to nationalization as follows: "The nationalization of the land—which, by the way, is a phrase he never used—it was used by Mill—did not mean making the land the property of the Government; it meant making it the property of the community."[33]

Early next year, speaking of the Scots crofters, George stated: "My recent visit proved conclusively what I knew and stated before, that the crofters really want land nationalization, not tenant rent tinkering."[34] A few weeks later he admitted that "Taxation supplies the form for the virtual nationalization of the land."[35] And a sub-headline in the London *Star* for March 11, 1889, ran: "He [Henry George] is Satisfied with the Progress of the Principle of Land Nationalization all the World Over."

These citations show that George believed that taxation of the rental value of the land would result in nationalization, but in nationalization with a difference. The State itself would not take the land, but the rent; and the program was in the end called the "single tax," not nationalization. George's doctrine was separated from that of nationalization by the distinction implied in "virtual."

The case for the designation of George's British program as socialism stands on weaker ground. The attitude of socialist writers in *Justice* and *Commonweal* indicated a disbelief in George as a socialist. They first tried to persuade him into their way of thinking, then openly attacked him as a non-socialist after 1886.[36] During his last two visits to Great Britain, socialists often formed a noisy core of opposition at his meetings. And whenever the question was put to him, George denied that he was a socialist. Unfortunately for the comprehension of his British public, however, he usually qualified the denial; he was not a socialist "in the strict sense of the term,"[37] or he would say that he approved of the work socialists were doing to draw attention to "public wrongs."[38]

[32] March 14 1883. *Henry George Collection.* Joynes was the Eton master arrested with George in Ireland.

[33] "Mr. Henry George's Lecture," Irish *Times*, April 10, 1884, p. 6.

[34] "Mr. Chamberlain Translated into Plain English" *op. cit.* p. 2.

[35] Henry George, and H. M. Hyndman, "Socialism and Rent Appropriation: a Dialogue," *Nineteenth Century*, XVII (February, 1885) p. 378.

[36] See my forthcoming paper.

[37] "Mr. Henry George on the Progress of his Principles," *Pall Mall Gazette*, Jan. 7, 1884, p. 1.

[38] "One Tax Only," London *Star*, March 20, 1889, p. 4.

Furthermore George made statements which seemed to make the distinction between his views and those of socialists very vague indeed. To a reporter who asked him about the nationalization of capital he replied, not by repudiating socialism, but by going half way to meet it. He said: "Insofar as by the nationalization of capital is meant the undertaking by the State of businesses that are in their nature monopolies—such as the telegraph, railway, etc.,—and assuming functions that are in their nature cooperative, I am in favor of it as fast as practicable."[39]

George's "Socialism": Production Under Public Supervision

GEORGE'S MOST EXPLICIT statement for British consumption of his sympathy for the cause of socialism occurred in his first debate with H. M. Hyndman early in 1885. George declared: "I can understand how a society must at some time become possible in which all production and exchange should be carried on under public supervision and for the public benefit, but I do not think it possible to attain that state at one leap, or to attain it now. . . . Destroy this monopoly in land and the present state of things would at the very least be enormously improved. If it were then found expedient to go further on the lines of socialism, we could do so, but why postpone the most necessary and the most important thing until all that you may think desirable could be accomplished."[40]

If George was sincere in the foregoing profession of belief, the statement is an admirable illustration of the breadth of George's social vision and his refusal to immolate himself in the ivory tower of doctrinaire theory.

It is natural to inquire what new light is shed on George by this survey of the proposals made by him in Great Britain for establishing a new and better society. The most obvious reflection is that British papers gave to the reading public a reasonably fair account of George's agitation and his land reform remedy. Though for the most part they did not accept the claims he made for his proposals, and though his assumptions that the land belonged to the people and that it should be returned to them without compensation violated their conventional sense of property rights, the newspapers generally confined their adverse criticism to their editorial columns and presented the facts without undue distortion in their news columns.

But George's lecture campaigns in Great Britain reveal more than this. First, they show an interesting addition to the message contained in *Prog-*

[39] "Mr. Chamberlain Translated into Plain English," *op. cit.*, p. 1.
[40] "Socialism and Rent Appropriation: a Dialogue," *op. cit.*, pp. 377–8.

ress and Poverty, the work which up to 1881 embodied all his ideas. *Progress and Poverty* makes no mention of nationalization, it does not discuss socialism, and it contains no such practical proposal for accomplishing George's ends as that of beginning with a moderate tax on land values.[41]

The reason for these differences between the book and George's British message concerns another consequence of his experience in Great Britain. George himself provided the clue when he remarked to a reporter that "The propagation of ideas is one thing, the carrying of these ideas into politics is another."[42] *Progress and Poverty* was mainly concerned with the propagation of ideas; when he went to Great Britain he was at once plunged into a political situation. There George was not a lone voice crying in the wilderness to a relatively small number of followers. He found a variety of planners and reformers who were preaching social and economic reform, and a large audience eager to hear a message of hope and to follow a leader to the promised land of a better life.

The record of George's British experience, especially that of his first three visits, is partly one of adapting his message to the political situation. This accounts for the emergence in his views of points either not stressed or not mentioned in *Progress and Poverty*. The book had shown him to be a man with a vision; his agitation in Great Britain revealed a willingness to adjust his views to circumstances. The British adventure was a proving ground for George and his land views.

The distinction which George had to make in Great Britain between theory and practice leads to a third result of his experiences there. George is shown to be not merely a prophet with a single idea, blind to all other points of view, as some people seem to consider him. He revealed, in fact, a remarkable willingness to co-operate with individuals and groups whose objectives were his, although they differed as to means. This explains his early use of platforms provided by the Social Democrats, the Land Nationalization Association, and the Land Reform Union; his very real friendship with the Marxist Hyndman; his campaign in 1889 in behalf of parliamentary candidates of the Radical party. It explains the virtual identification of his program with that of the land nationalizers, and his close association with socialist objectives. It explains, finally, his adoption of the program of the Financial Reform Association, his 4s. in the pound tax proposal.

[41] "The Irish Land Question," 1881, was of course the beginning of his adaptation of his principles to the political situation. It should therefore be thought of as closely related to the development of his British message.

[42] "Mr. Chamberlain Translated into Plain English," *op. cit.*, p. 2.

George, the Practical Gradualist

ALL THIS SUGGESTS what is too often overlooked about George, that he was a gradualist who distinguished between an immediate objective and a distant vision. George could at one and the same time see a future in which the single tax would prevail, and propose an immediate step in that direction by the imposition of his four shilling tax. He could strive in the here and now to bring about the single tax and at the same time admit to Hyndman that socialism was a possible necessity in the future.

Even his opponents recognized this quality of co-operation in George, his placing of human welfare above mere doctrine. The testimonial in an Edinburgh *Daily News* editorial was not an isolated phenomena: "He has the courage and the ability to break the chains of conventionalism which hamper alike thought and activity; he is possessed of an ideal which will not let him be satisfied with the shallow optimism which swells the chorus of triumph at modern progress; in short, he recognizes, and makes others recognize, that we are still a long way from social perfection as long as there exists around us a sweltering mass of physical destitution, intellectual degradation, and moral decay. To Mr. George may be conceded the honour of quickening the altruistic sentiment and deepening the feeling of discontent which is the guarantee of all social progress."[43]

George could scarcely have deserved this tribute had he stated his program along narrowly doctrinaire lines. It seems probable that as a result of his British experience both George and his message developed qualities which enabled him to appeal to a far wider audience than at the beginning of his transatlantic adventure.

Michigan State College,
East Lansing, Mich.

[43] Edinburgh *Evening News*, Feb. 28, 1884, p. 2.

> *The mode of taxation is quite as important as the amount. As a small burden badly placed may distress a horse that could carry with ease a much larger one properly adjusted, so a people may be impoverished and their power of producing wealth destroyed by taxation, which, if levied in another way, could be borne with ease.*
>
> HENRY GEORGE

Current Minority Policies and Their Implementation in International Unions*

By JOHN HOPE II

Introduction

THE EFFECTIVENESS of the policy of any organization, in the final analysis, must be measured in terms of the nature and extent of the action which it motivates. This standard is applicable to international unions. The test of *deeds*, it is believed, can throw some light upon real and effective minority policies which prevail in the post-World War II labor movement in the United States. It is alleged by some who deal regularly with union representatives at the bargaining table that in their daily dealings with these organizations, the "real" working policies of such organizations sometimes diverge widely from the "formal" official policies which are widely stated for public consumption. These critics state that the types of action which union officials pursue to assure harmonious relations between the dominant and minority groups in the plant and in the day-to-day operation of union affairs constitute a much more valid indication of the "real" minority policy than the "formal" statements which are made and publicized, in large measure, for political purposes.

In this article, these criticisms will be submitted to examination and some tentative generalizations drawn.[1]

The following questions will be considered:

a.) To what extent have unions adopted officially policies of non-discrimination as a basis for dealing with members of minority groups?
b.) To what minorities do these policies apply?

* The data found in this article were collected by the author in his capacity as Specialist on Industrial Relations, A.M.A. Race Relations Department, Social Science Institute, Fisk University, but the ideas and opinions expressed are his and are not necessarily the views of this agency.

[1] The tentative character of the results must be emphasized because information was not obtained from all international unions and because it was not feasible to verify the replies given by all unions which did give information. One student states that "union practices are impossible to discover with accuracy, for this is not the kind of information which union officials will report objectively, even if they know the practices of all member locals." (Clyde W. Summers, "Admission Policies of Labor Unions," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 61, 1946–1947 p. 91.) However, it is believed that by confining our queries to a few broad categories designating methods of implementation and obtaining these data from a large number of unions, the accuracy of our results in this rather "touchy" area have been maintained at a level which will allow, at least, a first approximation to useful generalizations.

c.) Among those international unions that avow a non-discriminatory policy, what are the principal methods and instrumentalities by which such policies have been implemented and put into practical operation?

d.) Is there any significant relationship between the means by which the espoused minority policies are implemented and the affiliation (AFL, CIO, or Independent), the structural type, the size, or the nature of the industries in which the respective internationals operate?

The answers to these questions are based primarily upon replies to questionnaires which were mailed to all international unions listed in the *Directory of National and International Unions.*[2] Responses were received from 88 or 44.2 per cent of the 199 unions recorded. These 88 internationals included approximately 7½ million union members.[3] Conspicuously lacking were replies from international unions whose minority policies have been established by scholars to be officially discriminatory.[4]

A study such as this has economic significance because of the ultimate impact of minority policies and their implementation upon the size of the national income, the level of harmony and efficiency of labor-management relations, and its influence upon the stability and strength of democratic institutions within the framework of our political system. Whether a worker who is a member of a minority group gets a fair chance to earn a living and whether the employer obtains the full utilization and motivation of his total labor force depend, in part, upon the attitudes and policies with regard to minorities which prevail among employers and unions, and how these are put into practice.

The union in a plant is in a position to improve or hamper the opportunities of minority employees through its influence upon the personnel

[2] United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, *Directory of National and International Unions and Research Directors*, July 1, 1946.

[3] Of these, 4 million or 53 per cent were members of CIO Unions; 3 million or 40 percent, were in AFL organizations; while 180,300 or 2.4 per cent were in independent international unions. Some unions did not report total memberships. Of the 88 respondent unions, 46 or 52.3 per cent were affiliated with AFL; 32, or 36.4 per cent, with CIO; and 10 or 11.4 per cent, were independent unions. While a larger percentage of all unions replying were affiliated with AFL than with CIO, a considerably larger proportion of the total number of CIO than of AFL unions replied, e.g., 32 or 80 per cent of the CIO unions; 46 or 44.2 per cent of the AFL unions; and 10 or 19.6 per cent of the independent unions.

[4] None of the railroad brotherhoods and only 6 of the AFL unions in the great departments in which the highly skilled craft unions within AFL have membership replied to our inquiry, *e.g.*, two replies from unions in the Buildings and Construction Trades Department; and none from the Railway Employees Department or the Maritime Trades Department. 45.5 per cent of all replies came from 40 AFL internationals which were not members of the above mentioned departments. (See also H. R. Northrup, "Organized Labor and the Negro," ch. 1; Summers, *op. cit.*, pp. 66–91; and Florence Murray, (ed.), *The Negro Year Book*, 1949, pp. 162–3, 164–5 and 168–9.

decisions of management, on the one hand, and through its powers of persuasion, education, and coercion over rank-and-file workers within its membership, on the other.[5] The policies and practices of the union locals, in turn, are influenced by the policies of their parent internationals.

Such actions of international unions have economic importance insofar as they affect the size and quality of the labor supply and ultimately the output of goods and services obtainable from given resources and technology. While the pattern of minority participation among all major parties to the production process may influence more or less the size of the output, attention in this article is confined to the impact of the international unions. However, the use of the coercive powers of government as a means of promoting the full utilization of all labor resources and assuring an equal opportunity for all to earn a living without discrimination because of minority status during the recent war and post-war period have directly and significantly affected the minority policies and practices of unions. Thus government cannot be ignored as a factor influencing the minority policies of labor organizations both in the present and future.[6]

On the other hand, since there remain 38 states, the District of Columbia, the territories, and the jurisdiction of the federal government (except for its own employees) which have not established compulsory minority labor policies, the prevailing types of voluntary action which international unions have taken in the absence of governmental coercion deserve careful study in order to appraise their adequacy and economic soundness; and the desirability of further extension of fair employment practice legislation to other areas.

The minority policies of internationals may be divided into the following two main groups: first, those controlling eligibility for membership; and second, those governing the treatment of their members who belong to minority groups, *i.e.* whether members are restricted in any way because

[5] Essentially, a labor union is organized to promote the economic interest of its members. As the union's power to gain its end depends upon its ability to weld its members into a unified whole so far as economic action is concerned, it must be equipped with means to reduce to impotence any divisive influences that appear. (Philip Taft, "Democracy in Trade Unions," *American Economic Review* (*Proceedings*), Vol. 36 (1946), p. 359).

[6] Executive Order No. 8802 of June 25, 1941 affirmed a federal policy of full participation in the defense program by all qualified persons regardless of race, creed, color, or national origin, and directed action in furtherance of this policy. During 1945 and 1946, six states established policies of fair employment practice. These were New York, New Jersey, Indiana, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. Since that time Oregon, Rhode Island, Washington, and New Mexico have joined this group. Municipalities having Fair Employment laws include Chicago, Illinois; Minneapolis, Minn.; St. Louis, Mo.; Milwaukee, Wis.; Philadelphia, Pa.; Cincinnati, Ohio; and Toledo, Ohio. (*The Negro Year Book*, 1949, *op. cit.*, pp. 223–6.)

of their minority status, in the rights due all members. The first of these has been adequately treated by several students and will not be discussed specifically in this article.[7]

The following conclusion of Mr. Summers is typical of those drawn concerning eligibility:

> Exclusionary policies are seldom found in industrial unions, but are restricted mainly to the skilled craft and railroad unions. Exclusion is far more prevalent in the older and well-intrenched unions than in the newer and less secure unions. In accord with both of these generalizations is the fact that provisions and practices denying the right to join are found almost exclusively in AFL and independent unions and are rarely found in the CIO union.
> Of the groups excluded, Negroes are unquestionably discriminated against most severely (p. 91).
> Out of 185 international unions, only 32 (20 AFL and 12 independent) denied the right to join (because of race) either by their constitutions, their by-laws, or by their established practices. These unions have about 2,500,000 members out of a total 13,500,000 members in all of the unions surveyed (p. 72).[8]

With regard to the treatment of minority members, the provisions of international constitutions and by-laws are much less specific than those concerned with membership eligibility and, consequently, their study through an analysis of such union statutes is less revealing and scarcely adequate for drawing representative conclusions.[9] However, some light has been thrown upon this subject through studies of patterns of minority participation in certain specific unions and in industrial situations in which certain important international unions were involved.[10]

In the present article, the minority policies officially stated and the means by which they are implemented are examined. From those, the type of treatment which minority members of unions may expect in the United States under present conditions may be inferred.[11]

[7] See Summers, *op. cit.*, pp. 66–91; and Northrup, *op. cit.*, ch. 1, for the most recent and comprehensive studies.

[8] Summers, *op. cit.*, p. 91 and 72 "(Because of race)" added by the present writer.

[9] Such constitutional provisions may be divided roughly into three categories: (a) those which specifically prohibit discrimination of any kind against any member because of his minority status, including membership eligibility and limitations upon participation as members; (b) those which confine their prohibitions to membership eligibility; and (c) those which are silent on both.

[10] See Northrup, *op. cit.*; C. L. Franklin, "The Negro Unionist of New York"; R. C. Weaver, "Negro Labor: A National Problem" and other articles by him; H. R. Clayton and G. S. Mitchell, "Black Workers and the New Unions."

[11] The analysis of international practices herein is based upon data gathered during the summer of 1947. On the basis of three separate studies of union minority policies

Minority Policies of International Unions

WITH REGARD to minority policy, international unions were asked whether they had officially adopted a policy of non-discrimination as a basis for dealing with members of minority groups and, if so, to which of them such policies applied, *e.g.*, racial, religious, national origin, and/or sex minorities. Almost none of these unions responding definitely stated that they did not have a policy of non-discrimination, a slightly larger group expressed uncertainty as to their policies, and an even larger group did not answer the question. Sixty-one or 69.3 per cent of the 88 internationals replying concerning their minority policy stated that they had a policy of non-discrimination. Only 6 or 6.8 per cent did not have such a policy, 8 or 9.1 per cent were uncertain as to their policy and 13 or 14.8 per cent did not reply to this question. Therefore, about seven-tenths of the reporting unions indicated a policy of non-discrimination while almost one-fourth of them were either uncertain what their policy was or were non-committal.

As to what minorities were protected by such union policies, 50 or 60.9 per cent of the 82 unions having no official policy of discrimination stated that they protected "all minorities" or that they allowed no discrimination in their unions because of race, religion, national origin, or sex. Thirty or 36.6 per cent of these unions were non-committal on this question. In short, of those unions which did not definitely admit that they pursued a discriminatory policy against minority groups, slightly under two thirds protected virtually all minorities while a little over one-third did not indicate what minorities they protected.

The vast majority of all organized labor is affiliated either with the American Federation of Labor or the Congress of Industrial Organizations. Partisans of CIO repeatedly state that CIO is, to say the least, more deeply concerned than AFL about discrimination within its member internationals. This is countered by those of pro-AFL sentiment with the argument that there are "good and bad unions" among both of these fed-

---

and practices, two local and one national, the author has found that unions which have official discriminatory policies generally decline to answer so that replies tend to include those of the unions which declare policies of non-discrimination but do not specifically implement them, and those which have such policies and take specific steps of one or more types to put them into practice. Thus, for the labor movement as a whole, the results tend to be biased somewhat in favor of the more equalitarian minority policies and practices. It will also be noted that the total number of unions answering varies from question to question simply because all did not answer every question. On the other hand, since the information requested is of a type that generally can be answered by some representative in the office of the international union, it is likely that in some cases, failure to answer is tantamount to the admission of discriminatory action. Consequently, the statistics of number of unions not replying to various questions assume real significance.

erations, that generalizations are dangerous and unfair to both, and that each union should be judged individually on the basis of its actions. The findings of this study indicate that about nine-tenths of the CIO affiliates reporting stated unequivocally that they had a policy of non-discrimination whereas only about three-fifths of the internationals affiliated with the AFL reported such a policy. To be more specific, 29 or 90.6 per cent of the CIO unions stated definitely that they had non-discriminatory policies whereas only 28 or 60.9 per cent of the AFL unions reported such a policy. Significantly, 2 or 6.3 per cent of the CIO internationals either did not indicate what their policies were or were uncertain as to what they were while 13 or 28.3 per cent of the AFL affiliates reporting were in this category.

The experience among independent unions was found to be more restrictive and more indefinite than that found among AFL unions. Only 4 or 40 per cent of the 10 independent unions reported a non-discrimination policy while the remaining 6 of the 10 reporting did not answer this question. It seems apparent from these data that the policy of CIO internationals as a group is much more generally and definitely non-discriminatory than that of internationals affiliated with the American Federation of Labor or those unaffiliated.

The question arises whether this difference is due to the basic differences in structural types which constitute the majority and tend to dominate the respective federations. The AFL continues to this day to be dominated in its policies by the philosophy of craft unions while the CIO is composed of industrial unions in which class consciousness tends to replace the restrictive job ties prevalent among AFL unions. If this difference in prevailing minority policy is based primarily upon structural differences, then we should expect that they would tend to disappear when the policies of unions classified without regard to affiliation, are compared.[12] This was not the fact.

Difference between the minority policies of unions organized along simple craft or amalgamated craft lines[13] and those organized on industrial or semi-industrial patterns were examined. Completely accurate classification of unions according to structural type is difficult.[14] However, an

[12] However it may be recalled that very few of the AFL craft unions which were members of the departments replied to this questionnaire.

[13] For simpliciy of expression, those unions which are either simple craft or amalgamated craft unions will be referred to henceforth simply as craft unions; while those which are either pure industrial unions or semi-industrial unions will be referred to as "industrial unions."

[14] For this reason, the responding unions were divided into three groups: first, simple craft and amalgamated craft unions; second, industrial and semi-industrial craft unions;

analysis of the actions of these unions clearly falling into one or the other of these categories was made.

While only 10 per cent more of the industrial unions than of the craft unions stated definitely that they had non-discrimination policies almost three times as many craft as industrial unions failed to reply to this query. Twenty-four or 75 per cent of the reporting internationals organized as industrial unions avowed a minority policy of non-discrimination while 19 or 65.5 per cent of the craft unions reporting pursued a similar policy. On the other hand, 5 or 17.2 per cent of the craft unions and only 2 or 6.3 per cent of the industrial unions failed to indicate whether they did or did not have such a policy. While 2 or 6.9 per cent of the craft unions and 3 or 9.4 per cent of the industrial unions stated that they did not have minority policies of non-discrimination, the number of internationals in both structural categories which were uncertain as to their policies was the same, *e.g.*, 3 or 10.3 per cent of the craft unions and 3 or 9.4 per cent of the industrial unions.

These statistics undoubtedly give some weight to the opinion that with regard to minority policy the experience in industrial unions as a structural type regardless of affiliation is not up to the standard of those maintained by the CIO unions as a group. Whereas about nine-tenths of the CIO industrial unions reporting positively espoused the non-discriminatory policy, only three-fourths of all industrial unions combined had such a policy. While 6 per cent of the CIO industrial unions were uncertain or non-committal as to the nature of their policies, 15.6 per cent of all industrial unions were in this category.

Therefore it may be concluded that CIO unions as a group have a more progressive policy in their dealings with minorities than do either AFL or independent unions and that this difference between AFL and CIO international union policies is not fully accounted for by the structural differences in types of unions which dominate these two federations.

It is quite probable that the official minority policies of these two federations and their means of putting them into practice have had a profound influence upon the policies of their member internationals. Likewise, the differences between the specific characteristics of the policies espoused by AFL and CIO, during the World War II and post-war periods, have probably played a major rôle in shaping the differences in international

and third, unions whose structural types could not be definitely placed in the first or second category without qualification. This third group has been eliminated from the discussion of structural types of unions. Consequently, our study of structural types is based upon 29 craft union internationals and 32 industrial internationals which constitute, respectively, 32.95 per cent and 36.36 per cent of the 88 respondent unions.

policies and their implementation among their respective AFL and CIO affiliates. These may account for some of the unexplained divergencies found above. A brief statement of the recent minority policies and the tools of implementation as indicated by official convention actions of AFL and CIO show clearly the differences in basic thinking between these two groups.

The official minority policy of the AFL during its formative years (up to 1890) was not unlike that with which the CIO launched its activities roughly a half century later. Even now, their official policies as expressed in broad general statements are similar. Both are officially opposed to discrimination because of race, creed, color, or national origin[15] but here their paths diverge. The CIO requires the acceptance of its non-discrimination policy as a condition for membership by all internationals while acceptance of the AFL policy by its member internationals is not mandatory. Both during and since World War II, the CIO has passed resolutions in support of a federal anti-discrimination commission which, they agreed, should have full jurisdiction over the activities of labor organizations[16] while the AFL has accepted in principle the idea of such a federal body but has not been in favor of its regulating the internal minority practices of labor unions.[17] While it is evident that this reservation upon the full endorsement of federal bans upon discrimination in employment is facing increasing opposition from within the ranks of AFL, it is safe to say that it still represents the majority position of AFL.[18]

[15] See Appendix A, Note 1.

[16] *Ibid.*, Note 2.

[17] *Ibid.*, Note 3.

[18] The resolutions of the 1947 AFL convention reveal the beginnings of a break with its past policy of accepting the principle of fair employment practices legislation but of opposing the application of compulsory regulation of unions by such a government agency. While the recommendations of the Executive Council which followed the 1944 policy were accepted by the Committee on Legislation and re-affirmed by the unanimous adoption by the Resolutions Committee (Resolution No. 23, p. 632), the convention also adopted the resolution on Fair Employment Legislation (No. 48) presented by delegates A. Phillip Randolph, and M. P. Webster of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters. This resolution recommended that AFL endorse and support FEP legislation in accordance with the position taken by its 1946 convention. This, according to Mr. Randolph, supported FEPC legislation "without reservation." Such action thus endorsed the punitive powers of government when applied against discriminatory unions.

The pertinent resolutions of the 1948 AFL convention are not as overtly contradictory as those of the previous convention (see resolution of Committee on Legislation) but it is doubtful whether the optimism of Mr. Webster in congratulating the Executive Council and the Resolutions Committee "for the unequivocal stand they have taken on FEPC and all of the Civil Rights programs," (remarks on resolution No. 9, p. 456–57) is entirely justified. The familiar wording regarding "the principle of equality of opportunity for all" and "the principles involving in these legislative measures are still in evidence" (p. 149, Report of Executive Council on Civil Rights), while the resolutions of Mr. Randolph,

Both have recommended the formation of anti-discrimination bodies within their constituent internationals, and state and local councils. However, whereas the AFL resolution recommending the formation of such committees specifically restricted their function to "teaching the membership, through discussion and dissemination of literature,"[19] the CIO did not thus limit the recommended activities of its internal anti-discrimination committees. During World War II, it established a National CIO Committee to Abolish Discrimination whose function was to implement the CIO constitutional objective. This was stated as follows:

> To bring about the effective organization of the working men and women of America, regardless of creed, color, or national origin, and to unite them for common action into labor unions for their mutual aid and protection.[20]

In addition to "teaching the membership," this Committee has the following responsibilities:

1. To promote the formation of such committees in industrial union councils—state, county, and municipal—and in CIO international unions.
2. To disseminate educational materials to the general public as well as to the union membership.
3. Through contact with government agencies, to promote the elimination of exclusionary or discriminatory practices in government agencies.
4. To cooperate with other groups whose programs are consistent with that of the CIO.[21]

While according to our information, there are some sixteen CIO international union and about one hundred industrial council committees,[22] only one AFL international union has reported such a committee and the AFL does not have comparable federation-wide machinery for handling such matters.

Furthermore, the comprehensive resolutions "for the protection of democracy" which have been repeatedly accepted by CIO conventions provide a broad field for specific constructive activity on the part of CIO anti-discrimination bodies which have not been matched by the directives

---

et al., on Civil Rights (No. 6) and FEPC (No. 9) which were adopted are quite comprehensive but less embarrassingly specific than those of the previous year.

[19] *Ibid.*, Note 4.

[20] CIO Department of Education and Research, "To Abolish Discrimination," p. 5.

[21] CIO Department of Education and Research, *op. cit.*, pp. 5–6.

[22] *Ibid.*, p. 8. As of November 1949, 16 CIO internationals had established such committees. (*Proceedings of the Eleventh Constitutional Convention*, CIO, 1949, p. 189.)

of AFL conventions.[23] Among the usual resolutions on Civil Rights and the Extension of Democracy, the 1948 Convention of CIO made the following significant addition.

We recommend:
That each CIO affiliate create a Civil Rights Committee or Department on Fair Practices within its respective organizations; and that each international union seek to have incorporated in their collective bargaining agreements non-discrimination clauses particularly pertaining to hiring.

Whereas these resolutions are usually confined to types of legislative and court action which are needed to foster democracy in which CIO unions can assist other interested groups, this recommendation[24] to its member internationals specifically indicates important internal steps that each can take without the necessity for co-operation or involvement of outside groups. It is an inward looking resolution which implies individual responsibility of internationals for results.

It appears likely that the more positive and comprehensive the policy of the federation and the more definite and specific its tools of enforcement, the greater the prospect that its affiliated internationals will pursue a non-discriminatory minority policy.

The nature of the main industry group in which a union operates also appeared to be significant. Unions in government agencies lagged far behind those in private industries. Twenty-three or 85.2 per cent of the unions having jurisdiction in non-manufacturing industries (excluding government agencies) and 33 or 70.2 per cent of those in manufacturing industries stated that they had policies of non-discrimination, while only 5 or 35.7 per cent of those having bargaining rights within government agencies had such policies.

No significant relationship appeared to exist between size of international and the minority policies of either AFL or the CIO unions.[25]

Approximately three-fifths of the AFL and nine-tenths of the CIO unions replying have non-discriminatory policies. When each of these groups was divided into three size classes, the percentages of AFL unions having such a policy ranged from 56 per cent to 66.7 per cent while those of the CIO group ranged from 87.5 per cent to 100 per cent.

[23] Labor Research Association, *op. cit.*, p. 117 (AFL 1946 Convention); CIO Final Proceedings, 1947, Resolution No. 9, pp. 264–67. 1948, Resolution No. 8, pp. 308–10; 1949, Resolution No. 20, pp. 368–70.

[24] Resolution No. 20, *Proceedings of the Eleventh Constitutional Convention*, CIO, 1949.

[25] In the analysis of unions according to size there were 46 AFL and 32 CIO internationals. This group was divided into three size classes, namely, 0 to 50,000; 50,000 to 100,000; and 100,000 members and over.

Summary—Minority Policies

SUMMARIZING with regard to minority policies, it may be stated that about 7 out of 10 internationals avow a non-discrimination policy and almost without exception these policies apply to those whose minority status arises from race, religion, national origin, or sex. Virtually all internationals affiliated with the CIO have such a policy while only 6 out of 10 AFL affiliates were thus committed. This difference is not fully explained by differences in structural type, size of international, or by the general nature of the industry groups in which the respective internationals have jurisdiction. However, there is some evidence that the impact of minority attitudes and policies of CIO and AFL *per se* is an important factor in the differences observed and that the influence of such policies is, in part, at least, a function of the quality and limitations of the machinery provided by these federations to implement their policies.

Means of Converting Minority Policy to Day-To-Day Operational Practices

FOR ANYONE who is acquainted with the working of basically democratic institutions, it will be realized that the positive statement by an international union that there shall be no discrimination against any worker because of race, creed, color, national origin, or sex is the beginning, not the end, of the long road toward equality of rights, privileges, and responsibilities for all workers in labor organizations. The social value of such a policy, in the long run, must depend upon the extent to which its principles are applied by the international in the day-to-day administration of union affairs and the vigor and speed with which the international officers attempt to convert it into normal routine practices of union operations. Such a policy, however comprehensively and convincingly written, is of limited value if in practice the administrative officers merely pay "lip service" to it and countenance day-to-day practices of their internationals and subordinate locals which are contrary to such principles. Consequently, in order to measure the current position of organized labor, it is necessary to examine how and to what extent the constituent non-discriminatory international unions put their democratic policies into day-to-day practice.

An examination of the activities of such unions reveals that only slightly less than one-half of them used at least one technique aimed at converting their policies into reality, while 37 or 45.1 per cent of the 82 internationals in this category did not report the use of any such techniques.

The methods of implementation may be classified into the following four categories: internal persuasive techniques; those involving the em-

ployer; internal coercive or specialized union methods; and other unspecified methods. The first three account for more than 90 per cent of all methods reported. (Of the 82 international unions which declared that they had non-discrimination policies, 40 or 48.8 per cent stated that they included speeches and discussions on the subject in the agendas of conventions, institutes, and meetings sponsored by their internationals; and 36 or 43.9 per cent included educational efforts aimed at combatting prejudices among their membership as an integral part of the educational program of their internationals. Among the types of educational programs mentioned were the following in descending order of their importance: 31 or 37.8 per cent of the internationals provided educational materials to locals; 19 or 23.2 per cent furnished speakers *without* prior request of the locals; while 24 or 29.3 per cent furnished consultation upon the request of the local; and 19 or 23.2 per cent provided consultation *with* prior request of the local. In seven of the unions, speakers on the subject of discrimination could only be sent to the locals which requested them and in five of them a similar procedure was required in order to furnish consultation to locals.

Moving from the means of implementing the non-discriminatory policy in internal union affairs to efforts at placing it in operation in employer-employee relationships, 31 or 37.8 per cent of the reporting internationals made public statements against discriminatory practices of their employers while only 25 or 30.5 per cent indicated that they had made a positive effort to obtain the inclusion of non-discrimination clauses in trade agreements with their employers.

With regard to the third category, only 14 or 17.1 per cent of non-discriminatory internationals enforced penalties against individual members or locals found guilty of discrimination and only 13 or 15.9 per cent had appointed standing committees to combat such discrimination.

To summarize, the following characteristics of the reporting unions are revealed:

1. That the internationals showed the highest preference for techniques of education and persuasion but relatively few of them were willing to apply specific penalties against those who violated their minority policies or to appoint standing committees to promote the enforcement of these policies.
2. Second only to their efforts to bring about fair practices in international union affairs by means of education and persuasion was their effort to promote fair employment practices on the part of the employers with whom they had bargaining rights. However, more of them expressed a willingness to make public statements against

such practices of their employers than were willing to seek the inclusion of non-discriminatory clauses in their contracts by the orderly process of negotiation.

3. Considerably more international unions were willing to seek non-discriminatory clauses which would outlaw unfair practices by their employers than were willing to apply penalties to their members who discriminated against other workers.

One must conclude from an analysis of the implementation techniques that unions lean heavily toward "lip service" methods and shy away from techniques with "teeth" in them; that they are a little more willing to put "teeth" in the measures which govern employer-employee relations than in those controlling their own internal relations; and that very many of them are non-committal as to the methods by which their avowed non-discriminatory policies are put into operation. The preference for public statements against employer practices over efforts to negotiate non-discrimination clauses also implies a leaning toward "lip service."

Factors Influencing Minority Practices

Is THIS PATTERN of operation of minority policy applicable to all kinds of international unions or may it be influenced by the federation with which it is affiliated, the structural type of its organization, the nature of the industry category in which it has jurisdiction, and/or its size? While the data available are not sufficient to give a complete answer to this question, some tentative conclusions, may be sought. The reporting unions were classified according to affiliation, structural type, broad industry category, and size. The patterns within each of these classifications were compared with the overall pattern described above. The bases to be used for comparison are (1) the order of importance or preference of the six specific methods of implementation used and (2) the frequency of use of each of these methods.[26] The order of importance of the six specific means of implementing international minority union policy does not appear to be influenced significantly by the affiliation, structural type, industry groups, or size of the international union. Internal union educational and persuasive methods were the most frequently used methods; seeking to involve the employer either through public statement or through agreement including non-discriminatory clauses in union-company contracts was next in order of importance;[27] while means involving the application of sanc-

[26] Since these six methods accounted for 94 per cent of the methods reported by all unions, they may be assumed to represent all types of practices which are quantitatively important.

[27] Among independent unions, efforts to obtain non-discriminatory clauses in contracts appeared more important than educational programs. Among AFL unions having 100,000

tions to members for discriminating and the establishment of special standing committees to handle such problems were least frequently employed.

On the other hand, with regard to relative frequency of use, a much larger proportion of all CIO unions reporting than either AFL or independent unions used each of these specific methods. For instance, eight out of every ten CIO internationals reporting which did not have a discriminatory policy employed speeches and discussions at conventions, institutes and other meetings sponsored by their internationals. On the other hand, only slightly less than three out of ten AFL unions and two out of ten independent unions used this form of anti-discrimination technique to implement their policies. While slightly over three out of ten CIO unions employed standing committees to combat discrimination and applied penalties to their members who indulged in discrimination, none of the independent unions and roughly one in each twenty AFL unions employed these techniques. At the other extreme, only about one out of ten CIO internationals was non-committal as to techniques used to implement their non-discrimination policies, while almost six out of ten AFL, and seven out of ten independent unions did not indicate their methods. The percentage of non-discriminatory CIO unions employing the internal union persuasive methods was about three times that found among comparable AFL unions. This differential ranges from three to eight times, widening continuously as one moves from the more frequently used to the least popular and most coercive methods.

On the other hand, the proportion of the AFL unions which did not indicate how they implemented their non-discriminatory policies was more than six times as large as that for CIO internationals, *i.e.*, 58.7 per cent of the AFL unions and 9.7 per cent of the CIO unions reporting did not answer.

Therefore, the following conclusions may be drawn with regard to methods used by internationals affiliated with the various federations:

1. The order of importance (frequency of use) of the six most significant methods of implementing the international non-discrimination policy is the same for AFL, CIO, and independent unions as well as for all main structural types of unions.
2. While the great majority of the CIO unions employed one or more of the specific means of implementation, a very small minority of either AFL or independent unions did so. The range of numbers of each group of unions using one or more of these methods is as follows: from 3.5 to eight out of each ten CIO unions; from .4

or more members, public statements ranked above education programs. Because of the small number of cases involved, neither of these apparent minor exceptions appear significant.

to 2.6 for each ten AFL unions; and from 0 to 2 for each ten independent unions reporting.

3. The difference in frequency of use of the same method between AFL and CIO unions was wider for the more coercive and specialized methods than for the essentially persuasive method.

In general, all three groups had a strong preference for persuasion over sanction and coercion but a much larger proportion of the CIO than either AFL or independent unions used one or more of the six major methods of putting the minority policy into practice and also showed a greater inclination to apply penalties and to use specialized machinery (a standing committee) to enforce their policies.

A comparison of the differences between the experiences of craft and industrial unions with those of AFL and CIO unions revealed, as in the case of their respective minority policies, that all differences between minority practices of AFL and CIO unions cannot be accounted for by the differences in structural types which dominate these two federations. Whereas from one and one-half to two times as many industrial unions out of each ten internationals as craft unions used one or more of the six major methods of implementing their non-discriminatory policy, between three and eight times as many CIO unions out of each ten as AFL unions used one or more of these methods.

Therefore, the more vigorous and comprehensive program of implementing their minority policies which characterizes the CIO internationals as a group as contrasted with the AFL group cannot be completely accounted for by the differences in the structural types of unions which dominate these two federations of labor organizations. It is probably safe to attribute this unexplained difference in large measure to the higher degree of control which the CIO exerts over its member internationals, its clear and mandatory non-discrimination policy, and the relative vigor, as compared with the AFL, with which it impresses this policy upon its member unions and individuals.

Neither the differences in characteristics of industries in which the internationals have bargaining rights nor the sizes of these internationals appear to have any observable influence upon the ways international unions put their anti-discriminatory policies into practice.

With regard to major industry groups, the patterns of implementation among unions operating in manufacturing and in non-manufacturing industries were essentially the same except in the frequency of use of penalties and specialized methods. The percentages of all non-discriminatory internationals in non-manufacturing industries which applied penalties

was over twice that of internationals in manufacturing. Standing committees were somewhat more prominent in the former than in the latter industry category. On the other hand, unions operating in government agencies lagged far behind both those in manufacturing and in non-manufacturing industries in the frequency with which they used the major techniques for carrying out their non-discriminatory minority policies. While percentages of unions in manufacturing industries using the various methods ranged from 12.8 per cent to 48.9 per cent and those in non-manufacturing, from 18.5 per cent to 51. 9 per cent, those in government agencies varied from 0 to 21. 4 per cent.

Only the most general and tentative conclusion can be drawn with regard to the influence of size of international upon patterns of anti-discrimination practices. There appeared to be no significant relationship between size and implementation patterns. Previously discussed differences in frequency of use between AFL and CIO unions and types of practices used were found in each size class.[28]

General Conclusions

IT MAY BE CONCLUDED that a considerably larger proportion of CIO than AFL unions was found to have anti-discrimination policies and of those which had such policies the former group was much more energetic than the latter in putting them into practice by applying specific techniques to combat unequal treatment in their unions and in their work places. However, for those unions, AFL and CIO, which sought to enforce their policies, there appeared little difference in their order of preference for the various methods of implementing these policies. All relied most heavily upon education and persuasion while relatively few had permanent committees or used machinery with punitive powers to handle those who violate their international minority edicts.

The reason for these phenomena are not within the scope of this article. Suffice it to say, that the differences cannot be explained solely by the fact that CIO unions are predominantly industrial in structure while those of AFL include both craft and industrial unions. However, it is probable that the historical background and the basic philosophies which dominate the leadership of these two federations at the present time have been strongly influenced by the structural types of the unions which have dominated these federations and from which their leadership has come in the past. Thus, while the current minority policies and practices of these

[28] When the sample was divided into three size categories, the number of cases in each was so small that one union could exert too large an influence upon the total size class to warrant drawing specific and final conclusions.

federations constitute a major factor in determining the current action of their constituent internationals, these cannot be isolated from structural types though other factors, undoubtedly, play an important part.

The unaffiliated as a group lagged behind affiliated unions both as to proportion having non-discriminatory policies and in the implementation of such policies. Likewise, internationals having jurisdiction in Government agencies were particularly laggard as compared with those operating in private business firms. It may be concluded that the minority actions of internationals are definitely influenced by the central bodies above them and of which they are members. Furthermore, the absence of this affiliation may account, in part, for the less progressive status of unaffiliated unions.

Social Science Institute,
Fisk University,
Nashville, Tenn.

APPENDIX A

AFL AND CIO STATEMENTS OF MINORITY POLICY

Note 1

The following resolution was adopted at the AFL Convention of 1893: "We here and now re-affirm as one of the cardinal principles of the labor movement that the working people must unite and organize irrespective of creed, color, sex, nationality or politics" (Spero and Harris, "The Black Worker," p. 87).

The CIO describes the official policy in its constitution as follows:

"To bring about the effective organization of the working men and women of America, regardless of creed, color, or national origin, and to unite them for common action into labor unions for their mutual aid and protection" (CIO Department of Education and Research, *To Abolish Discrimination,* p. 5).

Note 2

CIO, final Proceedings, 1947, *Ninth Constitutional Convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations,* Resolution No. 11, pp. 211–2. This resolution endorsed S. 984 and H. R. 2824 which includes unions within the jurisdiction of the anti-discrimination commission which would be authorized by such legislation.

Note 3

The Sixty-fourth Annual Convention of the AFL held in November 1944 passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That this convention demand . . . the establishment, by act of Congress, of a permanent Fair Employment Practices Commission, authorized to eliminate discrimination because of race, color, religion or national origin, in private industry as well as in government work, . . ." (AFL pamphlet, "The American Federation of Labor Fights Discrimination").

The Sixty-sixth Convention of the AFL held in October 1947 unanimously accepted the following recommendations of the Executive Council Report thus giving them the status of official resolution:

"The Council reiterates its declaration to the 1944 Convention as follows:

"It is our belief that, while protection of non-discriminatory employment is needed, especially during the difficult years that lie ahead, compulsory regulation of free and voluntary association of workers is inimical to the basic right of freedom of association.

Government activities, interfering in the self-government of labor organizations must not be permitted" (AFL, *Report of Proceedings, 1947 Convention*, pp. 521–2).

"The Council recommends increased effort to secure the enactment of legislation to abolish the poll tax, to enact anti-lynching legislation, and fair employment practices legislation, and further recommends that endeavors be made to bring these three matters up for debate early in the next session, so their passage will not be jeopardized by filibusters in the closing days of Congress" (*ibid.*, p. 522).

"RESOLVED, that we re-affirm our position in opposing discrimination against any person because of his race, color, creed or national origin (*ibid.*, Resolution No. 23).

"RESOLVED, that this sixty-sixth convention of the American Federation of Labor, assembled in San Francisco re-affirm the position of the Chicago convention of 1946 and go on record as endorsing and supporting Fair Employment Practice Legislation as expressed in the bills now before Congress.

"In connection with this resolution, your committee recommends that the Executive Council, AFL, have studies made of all bills introduced into the Congress dealing with this subject. With this comment, your committee recommends adoption of the resolution" (*ibid.*, Resolution No. 48).

"DELEGATE RANDOLPH (Sleeping Car Porters): Brother Chairman, I rise to concur in the report of the committee, except to suggest that the Resolutions Committee in the convention of 1946 in Chicago went on record as adopting the resolution on FEPC without reservations. I note that the report by the Executive Council also adopts the resolution in favor of FEPC, but refers to the action of the convention of 1944. Inasmuch as the convention of 1946 took favorable action on the resolution on FEPC, I took it as a matter of course that the Resolutions Committee would be in favor of adopting the attitude of the 1946 convention . . ." (*ibid.*, Remarks on Resolution No. 48).

"COMMITTEE SECRETARY FREY: ". . . The resolution calls for a reaffirmation of the action of the committee in the Chicago convention last year, and the committee this year recommends approval of the resolution which very definitely, if English means anything, is an approval of the policy of reaffirming our position last year . . ." (*ibid.*, Remarks on Resolution No. 48).

Note 4

Resolution Number 5 of the 1946 Convention of the AFL condemned discrimination "in all trade unions, international and local unions, central and state bodies, as a disruptive and destructive force which gnaws at the heart of organized labor." However, as a mode of attack upon this force, it only requested its affiliated unions "to set up anti-discrimination committees for the purpose of teaching the membership, through discussion and dissemination of literature, the dangers of discrimination because of race, creed, color, national origin and ancestry to our American democratic system of world peace" (Labor Research Association, "Labor Facts Book Eight," p. 112).

The resolution passed by the 1944 convention of the AFL was even less specific. It resolved ". . . That the Executive Council gives all possible support to the international and local unions in undertaking and carrying out an educational program calculated to promote tolerance, understanding, and amity among the various groups comprising the family of American organized labor" (AFL pamphlet, "The American Federation of Labor Fights Discrimination").

No other country has suffered so much from the attempt to force a manufacturing system into artificial life as Russia —for no where else has it been made on so large a scale upon a community so unprepared for the experiment, and where the interests of the vast majority were so identified with agricultural pursuits.

RICHARD COBDEN [1856]

Price-Fixing and Planned Economy

From Plato to the 'Reign of Terror'

*A Condensation of the Book**

By JACQUES *and* ROBERT LACOUR-GAYET

NO ONE SEEMS to have yet commented upon the fact that the principle of government interference in our economy had already been enunciated twenty-three centuries ago, with astounding prescience, by the divine Plato.

There is one dominant factor in his entire economic system and social concept. It is the strict and unflagging subordination of all human activity to the "Idea of Good," the supremacy of morals over politics and economics. The goal of good government is to assure the happiness, not of an individual or of a group, but of the City-State. There is no room in this republic for Machiavelli's Prince, for Nietzsche's Superman, or for the free play of individual greed for power, wealth, and lust.

At the top of his society, he set up an élite of wise men, nurtured with the essence of Good; visionaries of eternal beauty, who gathered each morning before sunrise. Finally, the concepts of Truth and Justice were to dominate every thought and every act.

"The State" says Plato in one of the most celebrated passages of his *Republic*, "comes into existence because no individual is self-sufficient; we all have many needs. So, having all these needs, we call on one another's help to satisfy our various requirements. And this association is what we call the State." Since food, shelter, and clothing are the fundamental needs of man, we must have farmers, builders, and weavers. But is the farmer going to spend most of his time building a house, weaving his clothes, or making his shoes? Isn't it better for everyone to confine himself to one trade, to specialize in that for which he is best suited?

The ruling class and the military caste may own nothing, as they are supported by the race of iron and brass, whose job it is to take care of its watchdogs. The 5,040 "magnates," or heads of family, are forbidden from engaging in trade or industry, as these are considered low and mercenary pursuits. To be a merchant is such a dishonor that even a jail sentence is only a minor added penalty.

Still, Plato recognizes the value of commerce as a means of "distrib-

* *De Platon à la Terreur.* Par Jacques et Robert Lacour-Gayet. Paris: Editions Spid, 1948.

uting equally and according to the needs of each individual, goods of all kinds which, of themselves, have no measure and no equivalence." Honest trade would benefit the City and a businessman above reproach should be given "as much consideration as a mother or a wetnurse."

Controlled Economy in the "Ideal State"

LIKE ARISTOTLE, PLATO considers that importing and exporting are matters of State. Intercourse with foreigners might tend to corrupt morals, and resulting changes in the mode of living are the greatest evil that threaten the State. The sea lures one to love commerce and gain, and this leads to cheating. The ideal City should therefore be located far inland and be as self-sufficient as possible.

At the very least, the importation of luxury items, perfumes from the Orient, the purple from Tyre, or exotic dyes, shall be strictly forbidden. At most, raw materials needed for national defense, such as woods and metals, may be brought in. The decision is up to the warlords. As to the products of the soil, they shall not leave the country.

Plato was the first to devise the monetary system which is so widely used nowadays. He was aware of the fact that, to meet obligations abroad, a currency had to be established which would be accepted throughout Greece. The State must therefore have in its coffers monies based on gold and silver. The returning traveller must turn over to the Treasury all foreign exchange still in his possession, and he will be reimbursed in local currency. The money used for internal transactions, wages, rents, and the purchase of goods will be practically worthless outside of the country, and the hoarding of gold and silver shall be prohibited.

When we read these lines, we cannot help but think of our modern terminology with its "gold standard" and "foreign exchange control." Certainly, Plato's sole intention was to protect the citizen from corruption by contact with gold. But what greater corruption was to be brought about by the dissemination of doctrines which claim kinship with Plato's thesis!

Currency in name only, money without intrinsic value, these are only too real and their use is constantly being advocated under various names and disguises. But we should not lose sight of the fact that they undermine the morality of the individual and that of the nation.

It would be idle to compare the provisions made for a little community of 5,000 citizens, contemporaries of Philip of Macedonia, with the conditions prevailing in a modern State with a population running into millions, whose means of production and exchange, whose requirements and

mode of living have nothing in common with those of the ancient Greeks. There are, however, some striking analogies.

Foreign trade and foreign exchange controls, an internal currency, price-fixing on cost-plus basis, limitation of wealth, wage controls, taxation of dividends, and excess profits, all these modern measures had already been conceived by the great philosopher.

We do not know whether a practical application of his superhuman doctrine would succeed in counteracting the powerful elements of profit and self-interest, but what we do know is that a controlled economy based only on compulsion, lacking moral support and any bonds with the soul and the heart of the people, is bound to fail.

Diocletian's Price-Fixing Edict

SON OF A FORMER SLAVE, soldier of fortune, Diocletian, who acceded to the Roman *imperium* in 285 A.D., was neither a philosopher nor a dreamer. His was one of the most domineering, theoretical minds of antiquity, and he deserves to be regarded as one of those professional organizers who, according to James Burnham, are destined to become the masters of our society. The adherents of a totalitarian *Weltanschauung*, of Hitler's controlled economy, or Stalin's planned society may well claim him as one of their own.

His Edict of 301 A.D., *De pretiis rerum venalium*, established a schedule of prices for salable commodities, thus translating his thinking into the field of economics.

A few years before the promulgation of this Edict, Diocletian had already instigated a monetary reform. The desire for uniformity was one of his most characteristic traits and he tried to impose the new currency on the whole empire. But the ineluctable outcome of these currency manipulations was that good money went into hiding.

Everyone tried to protect himself from having to accept devalued currency. A good portion of the payments made to the army and to public servants had to be in kind. Thus, a legion commander under Valerianus receives wheat, rye, lard, wine, oil, vegetables, horses, fodder, his clothing, and his weapons; a cook and a secretary, for whom he must make restitution; two of the most beautiful captives, for whom he must not; fuel and, in addition, 150 gold coins. Even the State protects itself against its own manipulations: payment of taxes and other levies has to be made in kind, in gold, or in silver!

As to the defenseless consumer, all he could do was to bear up under

the rises in prices. The preamble to the Edict of 301 vituperates against the speculators who, even in those days, were held responsible for the high cost of living. The consumer, says the preamble, is helpless in the presence of those who want to make a fortune overnight, their avarice robs the soldier, they boost the price of grain by speculation upon meteorological forecasts and use their capital to keep wheat out of the market.

It is the duty of the emperor to intervene, and the situation calls for emergency legislation.

The Edict itself, of which several fragments were found in Greece and in Asia, recognizes that abundance and low prices are the rule in certain provinces. Nevertheless, it stipulates that it is applicable to the whole *orbis terrarum*. It covers almost every conceivable commodity and—a natural consequence of a controlled system of economy—most salaries and wages.

No less than 759 categories are known to us, contained in some twenty chapters, and some of these classifications bear a strange resemblance to those listed in modern price schedules.

The prices shown in the schedule are retail prices and may not be exceeded under any circumstances. It is up to the dealer to make allowance, in his buying prices, for such items as transportation costs and overhead.

In his efforts to protect the consumer from higher prices, Diocletian established an intrinsic value, a sales price "per se" which bore no relation whatever to any previous price or to the cost of production. Anxious as he was to bring all phases of economic realities once and for all within the same plan of regimentation, he did not hesitate to encompass them within an absolute, rigid and permanent framework, created in its entirety by his administration.

Another and even more striking feature of the Edict is the fact that it marks the first time that the notion of the "economic delict," which was later to play such an important rôle, makes its appearance. There is a penalty for every violation. In cases where the fixed price is exceeded, only one penalty is provided for, both for the seller and the buyer, and it is the death penalty!

Capital punishment had been extremely rare under old Roman law, and the Twelve Tables sanctioned it only for two kinds of crime, theft by night and misconduct on the part of a vestal. The empire had invoked it mostly for political crimes. But Diocletian foresaw that he would have to resort to this threat if his planned economy was to succeed. The history of modern times vindicates his judgment.

Failure of Regimentation

DID THE EXECUTIONER SUCCEED? Price-fixing only brought about a scarcity of goods, which in turn resulted in extreme rises in prices and this continued until the law automatically fell into desuetude.

As methodical in the planning of his own destiny as he had been in the regimentation of the world, Diocletian climbed to the top of the Nicomedian hill one spring day in the year 305, twenty years after he had acceded to the imperial throne, and there, surrounded by his victorious legions he abdicated, in order to retire to a life of leisure on the cliffs of Solone, facing the Illyrian Sea.

As he slowly divested himself before the assembled multitude of all the divine attributes of an Oriental monarch, did he foresee the two great failures of his brilliant career? In the temporal field, the mechanism of prices was inexorably to regain the upper-hand. In the spiritual realm, the Church of Christ which had resigned itself to the most cruel persecution, was, eight years later, to become the Church Triumphant.

The "Fair Price" of the Middle Ages

THREE AMERICAN SCHOLARS[1] have compiled a list of all the price regulations recorded in history. They wisely refrained from going back beyond the fifth century B.C., and their list goes only as far as 1926. How much patience they would need if they tried to bring it up-to-date!

Their compilation is admittedly incomplete and yet it embraces 480 titles of works, treatises and reports on regulations affecting sixty countries, from Greece under Pericles to the United States under Coolidge.

Such a nomenclature fills one with awe for the economists and the statesmen who have tried to find the answer to every problem. How, then, did prices manage to slip, Houdini-like, out of so many shackles? To be sure, controls, at times, have succeeded in stemming a current, but they have never reversed its course.

What is usually the motivating force behind these government interventions? In almost every case, it is the belief that positive action can alone solve a problem. Men, especially men in public life, hate to appear passive, to be criticized for their inaction. To exercise patience in the face of a crisis would be tantamount to an admission of impotence.

On the other hand, they believe that they can show constructive imagination by opposing the natural course of events through laws, decrees, and ordinances. Public officials in the Middle Ages were imbued with that

[1] "Price-fixing by governments, 424 B.C. to 1926 A.D.," compiled by Mary G. Lacy, Annie M. Hannay and Emily L. Day, 1926.

idea as their forefathers had been before them and as their descendants were to be. A study of the "fair price" gives us an excellent insight into their mentality.

For centuries after the great invasions, life in Western Europe had undergone a profound change. Trade had come to a standstill, of luxury not even the memory remained. Driven by fear, people had fled the cities and found refuge in the less vulnerable countryside. As a natural consequence small autonomous groups came into being, determined to find their means of subsistence on the spot.

By and by confidence returned, people dared to look around, to move from place to place, even to embark upon the crusades. The attractions of urban life were rediscovered and the medieval city sprang up teeming, colorful, resonant. The merchants returned to the Temple and market places, and intermediaries stepped in between buyer and supplier. By and large, however, producers and consumers were in direct contact with each other. In modern parlance we would say that bilateral agreements were still the rule between the cities and the surrounding countryside.

"Fairness" Must Prevail

THERE WAS NO NATIONAL ECONOMY; local needs were satisfied by local availabilities. Why plant more than could be disposed of? There was no such thing as a "fixed price"—buyer and seller discussed the terms of each transaction in the manner of the bargaining which goes on in a Near Eastern bazaar. Every case called for its own decision as to what was "fair" and one had to be careful to compare the value of that which he gave to that which he received. The canonists insisted that the two be of equal value and there could be no compromise when it came to what constituted a "fair price."

If a man is forced to sell his house for a loaf of bread, it will avail him nothing to say that, at that particular moment, food was far more important to him than shelter. The transaction is unfair and the authorities are in duty bound to prevent its execution. In order to justify their intervention, they will not call upon statisticians to compare the index of food to the index of lodging, but, they will invoke the Christian precept: Do not do unto others what you do not wish done unto you. The logical, practical application of this doctrine is that a transaction is "fair" only if buyer and seller would be willing to exchange places.

This, at least, was the principle. In practice, the "fair price" was not set arbitrarily. The cost of raw materials, wage levels, grades, quality

were all taken into account. But these technical considerations were not final. If the parties could not agree, the collectivity had to decide, since it was imperative that no private arrangement should disturb the general equilibrium.

The basis of medieval "planning," then, is a spiritual one. In actuality, it resulted in hoarding, and this explains the many ordinances: It is unlawful to go out to meet the farmers halfway, produce must be brought within the walls of the city; goods are not to be sold on the wharves; all business must be transacted at certain places known to all and easily accessible; the prices of bread, meat and wine are fixed by law.

The big guilds played a vital part in the determination of the "fair price" but they were suspect because they were imbued with "capitalistic" spirit, hence they were never given unlimited powers or allowed to exercise a monopoly.

Commerce was given the blessing of the theologians, if it served to satisfy the "necessities of life," but not if its primary purpose was the "acquisition of riches."

As time went on, the canonists were hard put to preserve their doctrine in its original purity. Instead of a single "fair price," we find a "minimum fair price," a "medium fair price" and a "maximum fair price." However, the ideal of equity was deeply rooted in Christian philosophy and the following generations never lost sight of it.

"Maximum prices," "minimum wages," these modern terms would have appealed to the theologians, but they have acquired a different meaning. They no longer stand for the unity of a principle but for its discordances. How can controls be reconciled with freedom? How can we achieve equality without regimentation? Until this paradox is solved it is, in our opinion, useless to propound any economic doctrines.

The Ordinance of King John of France

As soon as the great plague which devastated Europe and claimed hundreds of thousands of lives in France alone, had subsided, people hastened to marry and prices skyrocketed. Just about that time King Philippe of France died and his son John (Jean) succeeded him. The following year, in February 1351, he promulgated the famous ordinance which is one of the most curious documents in the history of French economics.

The topics which it covers are of greatest interest not only for the light which they shed upon conditions then prevailing but even more for the bearing they have on our present day situation. The document contains literally hundreds of stipulations concerning price control. Every trade

group is affected, agriculture, clothing manufacture, foods, building trades, transportation, household workers. Special provisions are made for all phases of social and economic activities: buying and selling, preservation of foods, protection against fraud, compulsory labor, trade organizations, hiring, migration of labor, apprenticeship, and women's wages. Measures which seem to have originated in our lifetime, census of unemployment, exemption of luxury goods from price control, resale margins, already appear over the signature of King John.

The ordinance abounds in commercial regulations. Goods brought into the city may be sold on public market places. Buyers are not allowed to go out to meet suppliers of grain, fodder, coal, fish, fowl, eggs, or cheese, nor may they buy these in the suburbs. Non-essential middlemen are to be eliminated, the functions of seller and broker must not be cumulative. It is a violation to keep certain produce, such as salt, tallow or coal in stock beyond a certain time or above certain quantities.

In matters of employment, stress is laid on compulsory labor. Shirkers must leave Paris within three days, and this applies to both men and women. Violators are sentenced to three days at bread and water, repeaters placed in stocks, third offenders branded on the forehead and banished.

By June of 1351 the rising cost of living had already compelled the king to increase the wages of workers at the mint. In 1354 another attempt is made to fix prices, this time on a national scale. The uprising of 1356 brought the bourgeoisie to power and with it rose the clamor for a return to sound money which would insure stable prices.

Failure though it was, the ordinance is of more than passing interest. It shows the efforts made systematically by the king's men to assume the rôle of professionals. It is also enlightening as it typifies the artificial remedies to which governments resort in times of crises, attacking the effect rather than the cause. France was vanquished, her territory had been looted, the currency debased; such ills cannot be cured simply by the enactment of laws.

Rising Prices in the 16th Century

"WHOLESALE AND RETAIL food prices are so chaotic" states the author of the *Miroir des Francais*, published in 1581, "that, unless things are soon remedied, it will take as much gold and silver to feed a man as he weighs." Only an Aga Khan would be in a position to fulfill this requirement, but the same anguish is reflected in many pamphlets and treatises of the day dealing with what was then called "the bottom of the monetary abyss."

No less than 188 ordinances, edicts, declarations and mandates were issued during the sixteenth century in an effort to regulate the economy, but few of these were successfully enforced.

If Charles IX and his councilors had bothered to read the "Discourse on the Rising and Falling of Monies, be they Gold or Silver, and the Remedy thereto," published by Jean Bodin in 1567, they could have saved themselves the trouble of promulgating so many edicts. They would have read, for instance, that "the principal and almost sole cause of the rise in prices—which no one has heretofore hit upon—is the superabundance of gold and silver in this kingdom, which is greater than it has been in 400 years." But his common sense observation went unheeded.

The Trend Toward Liberalism

FOR TWO HUNDRED YEARS absolute power had been associated with controlled economy. When the monarchy ceased to be arbitrary, when the will of the people was substituted for the verdict of God, controls, taxation and all other acts by which the State had asserted itself over the individual became paradoxical.

Toward the middle of the eighteenth century the physiocrats had already attacked the theories of mercantilism, with an increasing measure of success. They proclaimed that the land was the real source of wealth, and not precious metals. Hence a favorable trade balance did not necessarily mean prosperity.

With even greater vigor and eloquence, Adam Smith had glorified the "invisible hand" which, unhampered, would bring harmony and prosperity to the world. By a strange coincidence, this catechism of economic emancipation, "The Wealth of Nations," was published in 1776, the year of the United States Declaration of Independence.

What, then, was the rôle of the State? Certainly it could not pretend to direct the economy, as this would only disturb that harmony. Should it remain absolutely passive? Tradition and reason rebelled against this notion, for "good laws make good citizens." Even individual liberty must be the product of some legislation.

The French Bill of Rights was adopted on August 26, 1789; on the 29th, the free circulation of grains was proclaimed. Two weeks later a report reads: "If we go back to the original elements on which the price of any commodity is based, we find that it depends primarily on the abundance or scarcity of that commodity, on the available number of consumers and on the amount of money in circulation."

Having thus sketched a definition of the law of supply and demand and the quantitative theory of money in terms that seem banal to us but were revolutionary then, the report goes on, in the true eighteenth century spirit, to salute the "natural order of things, which is so strong that no power on earth can oppose it."

Economic Liberalism Cannot Be Achieved by Decree

THE FRENCH CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY had established a constitutional monarchy: a dictatorial republic sprang up. Its dream was of brotherhood: war broke out. It worshipped "laissez-faire": the law of the maximum was introduced. The Revolution had been caught in a mesh of contradictions, and these obstacles have not yet been overcome. The principle of equality gnaws at the foundation of liberty like a horde of termites and the chief problem of our times is to check its ravage. If we fail to do so, our defense of economic liberalism will amount only to a series of rear guard actions.

The "Constituent" ended its labor on September 30, 1791, to be succeeded by the "Legislative Assembly." By the time the "Convention," in turn, came into power in France, the food problem had already become so pressing that it could no longer be ignored.

The "Law of the Maximum"

ON SEPTEMBER 9th, 1793, a general "ceiling" was placed on all prices. The schedule included all raw materials and every conceivable item of food and clothing, but articles in the luxury class were exempt. Of course, wages were also placed under control.

The law provided that anyone caught selling or buying above the legal price level had to pay a fine equal to double the value and—worse yet—would be listed as a suspect and treated as such. Informers were to receive one third of the confiscated goods and the entire amount of the fines. As a result, even honest merchants could be victimized by unscrupulous competitors. There was no appeal.

France learned that, to achieve independence, one must first submit to oppression. In spite of all, the black market flourished and the people complained that it was almost impossible to obtain anything at the official price. During the winter of 1793–1794 the scarcity of food caused a near panic. An eye-witness wrote that in Paris you saw "a huge mob of despair." Parisians would have shaken their heads in utter disbelief if they had been told that, shortly, the joy of living in Paris would again be such that foreigners would return in droves. Famine can never be a chronic ailment in France!

Even temporary economic upsets, however, do leave lasting imprints. The social and political evolution of France would undoubtedly have taken a different course, had the law of the maximum not been enacted.

This does not mean that Bonaparte would not have come into power if the economic policies of the Revolution had been different. His genius and his ambition would have found other pretexts. But, when a nation has become accustomed to disregarding the law, it can no longer stand up to dictatorship.

A few days before the fall of Robespierre, the official propaganda was still exalting the merits of the law of the maximum. Thus, a circular of July 12, 1794 declared: "This law is of greatest benefit to the nation: without it, greed and selfishness, acting in concert with aristocracy, would have starved out the people in the cruel agony of their needs."

Six months later, the Convention issued this astonishing proclamation: "Reason, Equity, the interests of the Republic have long looked upon the law of the maximum with reprobation. . . . It is obvious even to the unenlightened, that it was throttling commerce and agriculture. . . . The stricter the law was, the more intolerable it became. It is up to a free industry, to a regenerated commerce to multiply our resources and our means of exchange. Liberty, the true basis of trade and agriculture, will provide for the Republic."

On December 24, 1794, less than six months after it had been put into effect, the law was definitely abrogated.

Bonaparte was totally ignorant in matters of economics, but he soon realized what the country needed: a stable currency and freedom from controls. Tired of uncertainty and restrictions, France accepted these gifts with delirious gratitude.

Still, these technical reforms may never have borne fruit, if the political atmosphere had not also undergone a wonderful transformation. The Consulate turned hatred into appeasement; it worshipped unity instead of disunion. This was truly a glorious epoch during which the Old Regime and the Revolution seemed to march in unison in guiding the country toward a better destiny.

Paris and *New York*

Population and Resources

THE OLD CONTROVERSY about whether the world's population is outrunning its food supply, which was revived after the war by a series of popular authors in books that excited heated discussion throughout the United States, was brought before the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council this year. Members of the United Nations secretariat, aided by Prof. J. J. Spengler of Duke University, canvassed the world's expert information on the problem.

Estimates by the world's experts of the maximum carrying capacity of the earth range from 2,800,000,000 persons, or only 400,000,000 more than the world's estimated population at present, to 16,000,000,000, the commission was informed.

As far as the amount of land that is capable of being cultivated goes, here again the experts are far apart. The estimates run from 2,600,000,000 acres all the way to about 15,600,000,000, but a commonly accepted one is 4,000,000,000.

But the United Nations' specialists are not impressed by any of the estimates. The quality of agricultural land, even with modern technique, varies greatly. There are tremendous practical obstacles to be overcome if the yields now technically possible are to be realized. Increasing needs for food, due to the growth of population, may reduce the productivity of the land and improper methods of cultivation may damage it permanently.

"The estimates are made as if the world's food supply were a single reservoir on which all could draw, whereas the reservoir is actually a highly compartmentalized one," they say. "The fact that many of the world's peoples are denied access to some important parts of the world means that the actual capacity falls far short of what might be attained otherwise."

Pointing out that investment in capital equipment, international trade and migration are other means of achieving a balance between population and resources which determines to a considerable extent whether the world's productive capacities can be realized, the specialists examine the information on these aspects.

"The establishment of a self-perpetuating, workable international division of labor would appreciably improve the world's ability to provide a better living for its growing population," they find.

"A similar improvement would result, other things being equal, if the freedom of trade were increased, or if nations were joined in larger economic, if not political, units, or if the barriers to international migration were lowered."

They warned that countries with relatively stationary populations cannot escape the adverse effect of the reduction of per capita output anywhere by population growth. That effect will make itself felt through the medium of international prices of raw materials. The conclusion is compelling: social reform within particular nations is a matter of international concern.

WILL LISSNER

Max Weber, Assassination, and German Guilt

An Interview with Marianne Weber

By HOWARD BECKER

IN THE SPRING of 1945, shortly after the American entry into Heidelberg, the writer, then a field operative for the Office of Strategic Services, found occasion to interview Marianne Weber, widow of the famous sociologist. Frau Weber not only wrote an outstanding biography of her husband, *Max Weber: Ein Lebensbild*, but has also written her autobiography, *Erfülltes Leben* and *Lebenserrinerungen*. Further, she was for a long time one of the great leaders of the German woman's movement. In these and other ways she has acquired fame in her own right. Now in her late seventies (1949), she is still vigorous and courageous, speaking her mind freely about matters of public interest.

The interview was written down within an hour after it took place. No notes were made, but the writer had trained himself to the point where almost *verbatim* reproduction of short interviews had become possible, and two of his aides had been present and could therefore assist in the task of recall. In order to condense the material, the questions asked by the writer have been incorporated in Frau Weber's replies. In this respect only has there been any planned modification of the words actually spoken.[1]

Time, 9: 00 A.M., June 5, 1945; place, the sitting-room of the Weber residence. A large reddish sandstone bust of Max Weber dominates the scene.

The Interview

Frau Weber: I am very glad indeed to receive you this morning, gentlemen, even though the hour may seem inconvenient. Believe me, I want to help in the mutual understanding of Germans and Americans of good will as much as I can.

Do you want to ask me general or specific questions? You have told me something of your mission, that is true, and perhaps you are right in saying that I have enough sociological competence to have a good idea of what you want from me. Good: I shall talk, therefore,

[1] What appears to be Frau Weber's recollection of this same interview is recorded in her recent book, *Lebenserrinerungen* (Bremen: Johs. Storm Verlag, 1948), pp. 483–491. Her account differs in some details, but there is no essential deviation.

just as the spirit moves me; at my age there is no point in trying to dodge awkward issues.

To begin with, I must hang my head in shame at belonging to a people who, in the persons of some of its members, have committed crimes at which the whole world stands aghast. There is no evading a certain collective responsibility. Many of us could more or less justly say that we knew little or nothing of the diabolical perversions that made the concentration camps such scenes of horror, but we cannot therefore wash our hands of the whole filthy business. We are all in some sense guilty, and must all try to make amends, however slight these may be in view of the immeasurable extent of German criminality in this war.

We knew, to be sure, that the concentration camps existed, and that in all probability they were far from pleasant places. One after another of our acquaintances disappeared, never to be seen again. Nevertheless, it was impossible even to imagine the refined cruelty of these camps; no decent German—and there were and are many—could form the slightest image of the actual horror.

During the whole time of the Nazi tyranny I managed to keep together a group of people holding opinions like my own, and every Sunday afternoon, as well as on other occasions, we had meetings for discussion of matters vitally important to us. We did not, however, directly deal with political matters; we restricted ourselves to philosophical, religious, and esthetic topics, making our criticism of the Nazi system between the lines, as it were. None of us were of the stuff of which martyrs are made. Perhaps this is unfair, for there is no sense of being a martyr when there is nobody to witness the martyrdom and be affected thereby. We were in no such situation as the early Christians, who were devoured by lions in public. We would have been quietly exterminated in the dark, so to speak, with no one to witness our agony.

We knew, of course, of the opposition to Hitler, not only here in Heidelberg, but throughout Germany. I was personally acquainted with several of those involved in the attempted assassination of Hitler on July 20th, 1944; Germany and the world would have been spared untold misery had that putsch been successful. It must be emphasized that it was far more than a merely military affair; hundreds of civilians were involved, and hundreds executed. When it is said that there was no opposition to Hitler, don't forget the brave men and

women of July 20th. *My husband, had he been alive, would have been among them, for as you know, the German nation was for him a final value, a supreme end.*

Now that not only the German state but also the German nation are in a certain sense destroyed, it is clear that the only way we can be of use in the family of peoples is to contribute whatever we can to the world store of cultural values. Morever, the Germans of good will want to co-operate with the Allies in the administration of the country, and there is widespread agreement with a principle which I myself frequently emphasize; namely, that the Germans must do penance by submitting with good grace to whatever is necessary for their rehabilitation.

Mind you, I have just said "whatever is necessary." We cannot understand, for example, the necessity of what the Americans are now doing with their garbage. Hundreds of half-starved Heidelbergers could be nourished from what you wastefully throw away, but you pour gasoline over the garbage piles and set them on fire. It grieves me especially to see that lovely white bread utterly destroyed. You say that they might get dysentery from such refuse? Why not let them decide whether or not to take the risk?

But you also think that there is more to it than this? That we are not informed about the present sentiment of the American people? That the destruction of food is probably the simple-minded but sincere reaction of the ordinary American to the gruesome crimes he has heard about or seen with his own eyes? But are the military leaders swayed by such considerations? Oh, you think that in a democratic army there is a tendency to respond to shifts in public sentiment? Well, I can see how an officer might feel that he would be accused of being unduly soft if he were publicly to show Germans any favors whatever, and that his advancement in the service might even be endangered.

You may be right, but let me tell you about these other things too. The Americans have confiscated great fields of asparagus—well and good, they as conquerors are entitled to take whatever they think they really need. But they use only the tips of the asparagus, and throw the rest away, when thousands of poor people would be glad to make soup out of the stalks. Again, hundreds of bushels of strawberries were given to the Polish workers, who literally could not eat all of them. They were permitted to rot rather than give them to

the Germans. And these Polish workers, by the way, along with the French workers, have behaved just terribly, just terribly. But you are right in reminding me again that the Americans haven't had reason, recently, to think kindly of Germans; one can hardly blame them for favoring Poles and Frenchmen and others unduly.

Let me tell you, however, that even when you do think kindly of some of us, you are so wrapped up in red tape that you are unable to match your kindly feelings with kindly acts. Here is a case: there is a little railroad that sends a train to the country daily to bring in milk for the American forces. The German officials asked your military government for permission to add two cars to the train in order to bring in provisions, but because of certain regulations or some other inconsequential detail, the request was denied. And now we are unable to secure these provisions—green vegetables that will spoil if not used, chiefly—for love or money in Heidelberg. We live almost altogether on potatoes, of which, thank God, we still have a small supply.

We are all afraid, in fact, that your military governors are not competent. They are no doubt intelligent people, but they are quite unfamiliar with conditions in Germany, and they are seldom so much as able to understand the language. Consequently they are surrounded by interpreters who in many cases, we think, do not honestly transmit our messages and requests to their superiors. Of course people compare these unfavorable conditions with what they hear from Radio Berlin of the "luxurious" circumstances under which Germans in Russian-occupied territory are supposedly living now, not realizing, as I tell them, that mice are caught with cheese. But you must do something to counteract the pro-Russian sentiment, and you must do it soon, soon.

It can be done, for Heidelberg has long been a stronghold of liberal sentiment. Prince Max of Baden was after all the most liberal of all the German princes in the time of Wilhelm II, as you know, and he was strongly supported by the populace. Even during the time of the Nazis, it was possible for persons of competence and strong character to refrain from joining the Party. I could name one chemist, Freudenberg, whose daughter was married to a Jew but who was nevertheless kept on the staff, and a *Landesgerichtsdirektor* who refused to join the Party and whose wife was a "hybrid of the second degree" but who was promoted despite everything. No, people of

strong character in higher positions could refuse. That is why I never invited any intellectual who had joined the Party to my Sunday afternoon salons. People of lesser importance, on the contrary, people such as petty officials, could not so easily resist. They really did have to join the Party, and it is for this reason that I maintained it was highly unwise to discharge qualified civil servants and like administrative personnel merely on the ground that they were Party members. A department head, no matter how good, can do very little if his arms, figuratively speaking, are cut off. He must have suitable helpers.

At the risk of apparent contradiction, I must also tell you that the Nazis did everything they could to turn Heidelberg into a stronghold of National Socialism. When for whatever reason a strong personality of anti-Nazi stamp left the university, he was replaced by a thoroughly subaltern and mediocre successor. In the course of years, the university reached a very low level of academic quality indeed.

Among the students the pressure of persistent Nazification produced results the opposite of those intended. They finally came to cherish liberty above all else, even though this longing did not express itself in the form of organized action. For a time many of these young people used to come to my Sunday afternoon salons, but by-and-by they began to drop away, for they were becoming a little conspicuous, and in Hitler Germany it was dangerous to be even lukewarm and conspicuous at the same time. Where I was concerned, there was no persecution, for the Nazis probably thought that, old as I was, they would soon be rid of me through genuine natural causes. But here I am still. The good, I'm told, die young. Or is it that the young die good?

Such levity, alas, is sadly out of place nowadays. We are serious, and we must be. Have you heard Pastor Maas? I am not myself a Christian in any ordinary sense, but if I were, and if I were also a preacher, I should continually proclaim his message: "Germans, you have sinned in the eyes of God and man. You must repent, you must repent."

Goodbye, and don't think too harshly of us. There are good Germans still.

University of Wisconsin

Land-Capability Inventory Maps

THE LAND-CAPABILITY MAPS prepared by the United States Soil Conservation Service for farmers and ranchers are proving invaluable to many who are not farmers. Their main job is on a million farms in 2,350 Soil Conservation Districts where they help those who work out farm plans, farm by farm. But the maps prove useful to others of all sorts, from government agencies and business firms to city families looking for country places to buy. About one-fourth of our land has thus far been mapped in the land-capability inventory. The maps tell at a glance what the land of a farm or community can produce and where, and give facts about soils, slope, drainage, and irrigation needs, erosion and its cure or control, fertility, and so on.

Real estate dealers use the maps to guide prospective buyers; land appraisers find them of practical value. Individuals and organizations use them to measure the soundness of proposed investments. Banks and credit institutions find them helpful in carrying out credit programs and planning general economic improvement. Engineers use the information in flood-control, drainage, irrigation, and rural electrification operations, also in locating airports, radio installations, dams, and reservoirs. Highway departments turn to the maps to help them place roads and construction materials. Telephone and telegraph companies, oil and gas concerns that must control erosion along pipe lines, equipment manufacturers who wish to locate potential markets, and food processors hunting land suitable for growing the crops they use, all turn to these maps.

Game and fish organizations and sportsmen's groups like these maps around when they are planning improvement of wildlife habitats. Educators and students use the basic information in map form for planning courses and for classroom study. Agricultural research stations throughout the country use the land-capability maps and data as a basis for their investigations dealing with agricultural problems. The land-capability inventory, eventually to cover all the land of the country, is carried out in co-operation with these stations and fits in with their research. In the new Department of Agriculture bulletin, "The Measure of Our Land," J. G. Steele, S.C.S., tells about the land-capability inventory—what it is, why it's being made, and how to use the maps that are an important feature of this tremendous endeavor.

T. SWANN HARDING

USDA, Washington

The Corn Law Rhymes

By FRANCIS NEILSON

The Cry for Political Liberty

FROM TIME TO TIME, the nations of Europe have provided us with songs of poetic national ardor which linger in our memory. Three might be mentioned, which will be sufficient to set us thinking of others: *Rule Britannia, The Marseillaise,* and *Deutschland über Alles.* The songs of the Italians in Garibaldi's day were sung by children long after he left the scene. The Greeks, too, chanted their national hymns when Byron was at Missolonghi; and the Poles were rich in folk song, the themes of which are distinctly noted in Chopin's piano pieces. Most of these, however, were cries for political liberty, and perhaps that is the reason why some of them are remembered.

England of the days of James Thomson and Cowper indulged in national hymns of a strident character. *Rule Britannia* and *The British Grenadiers* can scarcely be surpassed in comic braggadocio. National aspirations can, of course, be carried to excess, and small wonder that, at different times, the French and the Germans have poked fun at the English for their extravagant claims.

Washington Irving, in "The Sketch Book," had a good-humored tilt at John Bull's bellicose nature. Other Americans took far too seriously the claim of Thomson in *Rule Britannia.*

> When Britain first, at heaven's command,
> Arose from out the azure main. . . .
> This was the charter of her land
> And guardian angels sung the strain. . . .

In recent years the English poured scorn upon *Deutschland über Alles.* There is something amusing in all this, because so much of the sentiment depends upon who is your political and military friend at the moment. Still, we cannot overlook the fact that national songs have their value as rallying media when a crisis arises.

Economic and Social Poems

THERE ARE SONGS that are not national, which left their mark upon generations of folk—these were economic and social. Somehow they are little thought of today, but they inspired wonders, accomplished by the

masses in making their grievances known to the powers that oppressed them.

About the middle of the thirteenth century, William Langland wrote his poem, "Piers Ploughman." In this we find a vivid description of the condition of the common folk of his day. Concerning that period there has recently been published the story of "The Peasant's Revolt, 1381" by Philip Lindsay and Reg Groves (Hutchinson & Co., London, 1950). It is a remarkable historical document and should not be overlooked by students who are working upon the economic history of the English people, for the book contains much new matter, and places the revolt in its true setting.

Lines from Langland's poem inspired impoverished men and women for generations, and perhaps gave them courage to voice their grievances in many crises. The people who rallied to the standards of Wat Tyler and Jack Cade were illiterate peasants, but they learned from poor clerks in minor orders the significant passages to be found in such poems as "Piers Ploughman."

There was nothing of nationalistic boastfulness in these odes. They revealed a plight of the people that was one of despair, and for centuries John Ball's question was asked:

> When Adam delved and Eve span
> Who was then a gentleman?

This was an echo of the lines to be found in "The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle":

> At the beginning we were all created equal; it is the tyranny of perverse men which has caused servitude to arise, in spite of God's love; if God had willed that there should be serfs, He would have said at the beginning of the world who should be serf and who should be lord.

A long history lies behind the revolts of the masses, centuries before the Corn Laws were abolished, but it is in this last period I would search for those songs that reached the ears of statesmen and forced them to redress the grievance of the wretched.

The Poets' Cry for Justice

THE NAMES of the poets who wrote the verses the people learned and sang for a generation before the Hungry Forties include many of the highest rank. Burns, Wordsworth, Shelley, Byron, and many others are an array of men whose genius can scarcely be surpassed by those of any other land. Byron's clarion cry rang out:

Snatch from the ashes of your sires
The embers of their former fires;
And he who in the strife expires
Will add to theirs a name of fear
That Tyranny shall quake to hear.

From one end of the land to the other, the poets gathered to express the woes of the people and to urge them to make their poverty known and demand justice. In Burns' lines there is the same strain that we found in "Piers Ploughman."

What tho' on homely fare we dine,
Wear hodden gray, and a' that;
Gie fools their silks, and knaves their wine—
A man's a man for a' that.
For a' that, and a' that,
Their tinsel show, and a' that;
The honest man, though e'er sae poor,
Is king o' men for a' that.

"Man's inhumanity to man" was the theme of peasant-poet of Scotland; and nobleman Byron—rich poet, poor poet, too—took up the strain, all in the long tradition since the days of William Langland.

What a history it is, and how little we regard it today! Perhaps we need another James Russell Lowell to remind us of our duty and also of the work to which Lincoln set his hand. We talk so glibly today about freedom and liberty and "our way of life" that a stranger would think, to hear us cackle, that there was no such thing as poverty and restriction in the land. Lowell wrote:

Is true freedom but to break
Fetters for our own dear sake,
And with leathern hearts forget
That we owe mankind a debt?
No! true freedom is to share
All the chains our brothers wear,
And with heart and hand to be
Earnest to make others free!

A daring Wordsworth, if there were one today, might write:

The world is too much with us; late and soon,
Getting and spending, we lay waste our powers:
Little we see in Nature that is ours;
We have given our hearts away, a sordid boon!

The Aftermath of Enclosure

LONG BEFORE the Corn Law rhymers set to work, the sound of distant thunder was heard in many poems. Goldsmith's "The Deserted Village" must have reminded many a vicar of a small community of the desolation caused by enclosure of land by force and by Act of Parliament. The exodus from the country to the towns created a congested labor market and drove wages down to the point of penury.

Perhaps it was George Crabbe who sounded the first alarm in his poem, "The Village." There he describes the condition of the parish workhouse:

> Theirs is yon house that holds the parish poor,
> Whose walls of mud scarce bear the broken door;
> There, where the putrid vapours, flagging, play,
> And the dull wheel hums doleful through the day;
> There children dwell who know no parents' care;
> Parents who know no children's love dwell there;
> Heart-broken matrons on their joyless bed,
> Forsaken wives, and mothers never wed;
> Dejected widows with unheeded tears,
> And crippled age with more than childhood-fears;
> The lame, the blind, and, far the happiest they!
> The moping idiot and the madman gay.

This awful picture of "the place of refuge" of England's poor contained perhaps the spark that fired the imagination of many a poet that came after its author. Sir Walter Scott, in his last days, often asked for some poems of Crabbe to be read to him. And Cardinal Newman considered "Tales of the Hall" to be "one of the most touching in our language." Its author is now forgotten, but his place in the revolt against poverty is assured.

Byron has described in "The Age of Bronze" the condition of England and the ambition of her landlords. In this poem he presents to us the statecraft, the foreign policy, and the futility of her recurring wars as no one else has done:

> Alas, the country! how shall tongue or pen
> Bewail her now *un*country gentlemen?
> See these inglorious Cincinnati swarm,
> Farmers of war, dictators of the farm;
> *Their* ploughshare was the sword in hireling hands,
> *Their* fields manured by gore of other lands;
> Safe in their barns, these Sabine tillers sent
> Their brethren out to battle—why? for rent!
> Year after year they voted cent. per cent.,
> Blood, sweat, and tear-wrung millions—why? for rent!

They roar'd, they dined, they drank, they swore they meant
To die for England—why then live?—for rent!

Goldsmith had put this in a single line: "Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law." The poets were outspoken in that day and did not hesitate to speak fearlessly to those in authority about the woes of the hungry. The Merrie England of the maypole and the dance had been swept away as if a cyclone had struck the villages. Yet, there was merriment in high places, and there were revelry and mirth at court, and in the houses of the rich. It took long years to impress the government with the fact that the economic disabilities of the wretched should receive its attention. The influence and zeal of Lord Suffield were of no avail. Referring to the condition of the country, he tells us he could make no impression on Lord Melbourne, who looked upon the subject as a bore.

About that time Shelley wrote "Men of England." The verses have the roll of thunder and are filled with the warning that the lightning will strike:

Men of England, wherefore plough
For the lords who lay ye low?
Wherefore weave with toil and care
The rich robes your tyrants wear?

The seed ye sow, another reaps,
The wealth ye find, another keeps;
The robes ye weave, another wears;
The arms ye forge, another bears.

With plough and spade, and hoe and loom,
Trace your graves, and fill your tomb;
And weave your winding-sheet, till fair
England be your sepulchre.

Perhaps the songs of Ernest Jones stirred the people more deeply than the poetic protests of Wordsworth, Byron and Shelley. Jones' "A Song of the Lower Classes" was remembered by country folk for two generations after it was composed. The writer of this essay has often heard an agricultural laborer whisper some of its pregnant lines, when no squire was about to hear him.

We plough and sow—we're so very, very low
  That we delve in the dirty clay.
Till we bless the plain with the golden grain
  And the vale with the fragrant hay.

We're low, we're low—we're very, very low—
  And yet when the trumpets ring
The thrust of a poor man's arm will go
  Through the heart of the proudest king.

We're low, we're low—our place we know,
We're only the rank and file;
We're not too low to kill the foe,
But too low to touch the spoil.

If we had poets today who wrote such lines, I presume they would be condemned as outright proletarian propagandists inspired by Moscow. But when the deepening distress of the Hungry Forties could no longer be ignored by Parliament, no one had the temerity to castigate the poets who wrote memorable verse which revealed the shameful degradation of the folk. Moreover, there were by that time men in Parliament who knew the facts and presented them courageously to the government. Both Cobden and Bright, to say nothing of Villiers, called for redress of grievance; and so impressive were their demands that they converted Sir Robert Peel, whose government abolished the Corn Laws.

Repeal of the Corn Laws

IT IS THE FASHION now, and has been since Marx's day, to question the sincerity of these free traders, accusing them of selfish aims and the desire for an abundance of low-paid labor. The people who are guilty of making this charge overlook the facts that not only Gladstone and Disraeli paid tribute to their honesty and courage, but that also the Conservative party, the landlords' one, after a few years became as free trade in sentiment as the Liberal party itself.

The statistics of the advance made in the industrial activities of the people after the abolition of the Corn Laws and after the breakfast-table duties were repealed by Gladstone, show the most astonishing recovery of individual welfare, without any assistance from the State, that can be found in the annals of any country.

The cry of the Corn Law rhymers was effective without the aid of a Wat Tyler or a Jack Cade. The poets did more, perhaps, to convince the people that they could save themselves than even Cobden and Bright succeeded in doing from the platforms. Wathen Call's "The People's Petition," written when the distress was most painful in the Hungry Forties, was recited in full by an old agricultural laborer at a political meeting as late as 1906:

O Lords! O rulers of the nation!
O softly clothed! O richly fed!
O men of wealth and noble station!
Give us our daily bread.

For you we are content to toil,
For you our blood like rain is shed;
Then lords and rulers of the soil,
Give us our daily bread.

The Minor Poets

THE MINOR POETS who read the longings of the people in their distress wrote what the miserable were thinking and dared not mutter. Some of them described their woe in the vernacular, and scores of lines that might have been penned by a Shelley or a Byron can be taken from their verses. Often they reach an elevation of poetic quality that is surprising. In Gerald Massey's poems there are many such lines. For example:

And love should spring from buried hate,
Like flowers from winter's tomb.

Tom Hood's "The Song of the Shirt" and Elizabeth Browning's "The Cry of the Children" are so well known that it is scarcely necessary to mention them. The poems of Arthur Clough and Charles Mackey may be found in the anthologies.

In *The Times Literary Supplement* of December 2, 1949, there was a review of the work of Ebenezer Elliott. He wrote *God Save the People.* It became known as "The People's National Anthem," and it was sung at Nonconformist religious services, and especially by the men at the great Brotherhood meetings. Perhaps it was the most popular of all the verse written by the Corn Law rhymsters.

It is hard to tell why the work of Ebenezer Elliott has been overlooked by some of the anthologists of a generation ago, for Carlyle's essay, "Corn-Law Rhymes," written for *The Edinburgh Review* (1832), deals with one of the most extraordinary characters in England of that period. Elliott was a prosperous iron and steel merchant of Sheffield; indeed, one of the minor bourgeoisie.

The man who wrote "Dream of Enoch Wray" deserves to be remembered. Carlyle's essay is instructive for those who would understand the tribulations of the English poor in Elliott's day. He says in his review:

. . . Alas, how many brave hearts, ground to pieces in that unequal battle, have already sunk; in every sinking heart, a Tragedy. . . . Must it grow worse and worse, till the last brave heart is broken in England; and this same "brave Peasantry" has become a kennel of wild-howling ravenous Paupers?

The writer of the review of Elliott's work, which appeared in *The Times Literary Supplement*, reminds us:

. . . Between 1830 and 1840 he had risen to a position in English poetry in which his contemporaries looked on him as the peer of Crabbe and Burns. He counted his friends in all ranks of society. His sincerity and vigour had won him the respect of critics of widely differing views. He had been foremost in opening new fields for poetry and, in Herford's words,

> he may claim to have carried out that part of Wordsworth's poetic programme from which Wordsworth himself "averted his ken" and given his voice to
>
> the fierce confederate storm
> Of sorrow barricaded evermore
> Within the walls of cities.

What the people would have done without the poets for the generation that followed Waterloo is hard to tell. Private members of Parliament might have succeeded at length in voicing their claims in the House of Commons and brought about relief. But such poems as were written were learned by heart by thousands who could not read, and were repeated at the firesides of those who felt the misery. The poem is remembered. The speech is forgotten. The latter serves for the time of the meeting, but the verse that described the condition of the mass touched the soul of those who had no chance to hear such men as Cobden and Bright.

The children of those who lived in the Hungry Forties remembered the lines, and for two generations after the abolition of the Corn Laws, old men who could tell the story of their parents' suffering would, if they had confidence in one, repeat the verse their illiterate fathers had learned.

Many of these poems were used by Socialists at their meetings fifty years ago, but apart from the desire for brotherhood, there is no Socialistic sentiment in any of them. All the people wished in the middle of the last century was to have a chance to better themselves by their own endeavor and enjoy the fruits of their labor. They desired relief from the crushing burdens imposed by the system of protection. This was the reason for the great battle that took place, and it was won in Parliament and not at the barricades.

Is it a poet that we need to make plain to our Congressmen that there are distresses now that afflict the people and should be relieved? Alas, our poets have other themes, and there seems to be no one, since Carl Sandburg wrote his early verse and Edwin Markham wrote his "Man with the Hoe," to voice the thoughts of those who find our way of life no easy matter, with all the crushing taxation, the restrictions upon thought and speech, and the horror of war and its consequences.

Somehow we do not realize that a generation is poor indeed that has no post to speak for the people. And the contrast between the versifiers

today—their themes, their forms, and all the modern gadgets of style—is so wide, when compared with the men who championed the desires of the people over a hundred years ago, that old folk who remember vividly the history of stint and pain despair of finding a people's poet.

Port Washington, N. Y.

Multiple Crop Insurance

MULTIPLE CROP INSURANCE (now available in 55 counties of the United States) provides protection to the insured against loss on his insurable crops due to unavoidable causes such as drought, flood, hail, insect infestation, plant disease, winter-kill. It is part of the authorized program of the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. Legislation provides that multiple crop insurance shall not be provided in any county unless written applications for insurance are filed which cover at least 200 farms or one-third of the farms producing the insurable commodities, whichever is the lower. Each insurance unit will be counted as one farm in meeting this requirement.

The insured is protected on annual crops each year generally from the time of seeding to the completion of harvest. For crops other than annuals the protection extends generally over the growing period. Only one application and one policy is needed by a producer for all his operations in a county. In the multiple crop program a farmer insures all of his insurable crops under one contract and the protection offered is against loss from all insured crops combined. This plan thus gives the diversified farmer protection against the loss of the major part of his total investment in most of his crops rather than against a smaller part of his total investment which may be represented by some one or two crops.

There is a coverage established in dollars for the insurance unit based on the number of acres planted to the various insured crops. The premium is based on the number of acres and interest in each insured crop, the risks on the various crops, and the extent of diversification. To avoid the inconvenience of periodic renewal, the policy has no termination date and continues in effect from year to year until canceled by either the insured or the Corporation. For the protection of both, the policy specifies a date for each county prior to which cancellation by either party must be made for any crop year. Notices of changes, if any, in the contract will be mailed to the insured at least 15 days prior to cancellation date.

T. SWANN HARDING

USDA, Washington

Treason to Liberty

THE GREAT TRAGEDY of our day is that the very fibre of our nation is being weakened, although thinking citizens do not realize it. We are losing even the will to struggle for a rational solution of our social problems. A listlessness, a resignation to the inevitable, has already set in among sections of the masses. Economic insecurity has made dullards of millions of our citizens, whose chief concern in life is filling the larder.

Aldous Huxley, in "Science, Liberty and Peace," warns aptly:

> At the present time the horrors of insecurity, as exemplified above all in mass unemployment, have impressed themselves so deeply upon the popular mind that, if offered the choice between liberty and security, most people would almost unhesitatingly vote for security. . . . There is no question, in the contemporary world, of any popular movement in favor of liberty. On the contrary, the masses are everywhere clamoring for even greater governmental control of everything. Nor are these demands exclusively confined to the masses. The owners and managers of the various capitalist systems of production are also victims of insecurity. They too would like a measure of governmental control—enough control to guarantee profits, but not so much, of course, as to constitute expropriation or nationalization.

State socialism might improve the economic status of these insecure millions of Americans. However, under socialism the individual would become more helpless and impotent than he is today under our free institutions. Today the individual can change masters. Under socialism the State would become the permanent master. Huxley notes:

> It (socialism) is just benevolent despotism, and there is nothing in the records of history to justify us in the belief that any benevolent despotism will long retain its benevolence. The appetite for power grows with every successive satisfaction of that most alluring and pernicious of all lusts. Against the temptations to abuse power there is no answer.

Our leaders offer nothing more than artificial respirants, restraints, taboos, prohibitions, hypodermic injections, half cures, palliatives and opiates as remedies. These have further sapped our vitality. In consequence, many question the wisdom of our forefathers in establishing a republican form of government.

We cannot continue indefinitely to treat our problems with these nostrums. Sooner than we think, the barbarians within the gates will seek out a benevolent despot and join other nations experimenting with full-fledged socialist systems. By such steps, civilizations decline.

MAX M. KORSHAK

Chicago

The Civic Revival in Ohio

Gas and Ice Monopolies in Toledo

By ROBERT H. BREMNER

DURING THE EIGHTEEN-NINETIES and in the early years of the twentieth century the people of Toledo made two interesting attempts to break the monopolization by private corporations of the supply of two natural commodities necessary to life in the city. An account of the contrasting methods and results obtained by these ventures in trust-busting constitutes an instructive footnote to the history of the anti-trust movement in the United States. When the citizens of Toledo realized that control of their supply of natural gas had been allowed to slip into the hands of companies dominated by men connected with the Standard Oil Company, they labored against tremendous odds to build a municipal natural gas system. Sixteen years later a combination of Toledo ice merchants induced a precipitous rise in the price of ice. Then the city sought relief by prosecuting the ice men under the Ohio anti-trust law.

On the surface, the municipal gas plant was a costly blunder and the prosecution of the ice merchants was a brilliant success. But the Civic Revivalists looked deeper. They thought the complete history of the natural gas plant represented not the failure of municipal ownership but the refusal of the city to take advantage of its benefits. The full story of the ice trust cases only confirmed their belief in the superficiality of criminal prosecution as a way of attacking monopoly.

The White Elephant

IN 1897 TWO COMPANIES received franchises to supply the city of Toledo with natural gas. The apprehension of the citizens was aroused when it was revealed that the two companies were in reality one in policy and management. Their fears were heightened by the growing conviction that both were controlled by the Standard Oil Company. All of their misgivings seemed to be corroborated when the two companies stopped work on the laying of pipe lines and refused to continue until the Council had amended the original franchise ordinances so as to enable them to charge higher gas rates. Having won the rate increases the companies completed the pipe lines, but before popular distrust of them had died down it was revived in even more bitter form by their practice of discrim-

inating between gas customers. Some industrial consumers were granted cheaper rates than those charged the public as a whole. Some firms were denied any gas at all. Now the people's indignation boiled over and after a remarkable demonstration of civic determination the State Legislature was persuaded to authorize the city to issue bonds for the construction of a municipal natural gas system.[1]

Whatever may have been their relation to Standard Oil, the Toledo gas companies fought the city gas plant with the practices perfected by the oil trust for use against its private competitors.[2] Defamation, financial pressure, litigation, discrimination—even violence, were their weapons. Toledo's one morning newspaper was purchased by interests friendly to the gas companies and turned into a virulent enemy of the municipal gas enterprise. A journal of small circulation and smaller local reputation, its editorial blasts at the city's credit nevertheless were reprinted in Eastern financial magazines and newspapers as the weighty opinion of a reputable paper about political and financial conditions in Toledo. This was important because Toledo was not a self-contained economic unit but an appendage of the great world of finance. Most of the money which was changing the city from a market town to an industrial center came from the East. "A whisper started through the offices of the great capitalists in New York and abroad would flash back by wire to Toledo and go like quick poison through its industries and credit, private and public."[3] The Standard Oil Company aided the Toledo gas firms by sending out agents who advised the important investment banking houses not to bid on issues as risky as the Toledo natural gas bonds. Every step in the construction of the city's system was delayed by law suits whose aims seem to have been to delay the building of the plant, to increase its cost, and to discredit its bonds rather more than to settle bona fide legal questions. The private companies sought to win influential men to their side by a liberal use of the old policy of rate discrimination. In effect this was an application of the rebate system. When all else failed, they tried to exhaust the city's supply of natural gas by pumping heavily and exclusively from wells they

[1] The most detailed account of the building of the municipal gas plant in Toledo is in Henry Demarest Lloyd, "Wealth Against Commonwealth" (New York, 1894), pp. 305–68. My discussion of the early phases of the Toledo gas war is based on the material presented by Lloyd.

[2] Lloyd assumed the companies were subsidiaries of Standard Oil. Allan Nevins in "John D. Rockefeller" (2 vols. New York, 1941), vol. II, p. 336, minimizes the connection between the gas companies. Nevertheless, the belief that the gas companies were controlled by the hated oil trust was one of the strongest reasons why the people of Toledo undertook to build a municipal plant.

[3] Lloyd, *op. cit.*, p. 311.

owned on land adjacent to the city's gas property. Then they delayed the purchase of the pumps made necessary by the lowered pressure in the city-owned wells by securing an injunction which temporarily prevented the city gas trustees from buying the needed equipment. Employees of the old companies were reported to have threatened to dynamite any pumps the city might install. This may well have been just a newspaper story but during the winter of 1891–1892 two of the most important lines in the city system were mysteriously disconnected—by whom it was never discovered.[4]

In spite of all these obstructions the city gas plant was built and put into operation. Toledoans themselves put up the capital for it when outside investors were frightened away. Toledo contractors agreed to lay the pipe and accept bonds in lieu of cash payment. The increased cost of the plant and some of the inefficiencies of the system of which its enemies later complained were the direct result of the expedients the city had to use to circumvent the fierce opposition of the old companies. By 1891 gas was flowing to customers through municipally-owned gas lines from municipally-owned wells. Two years later the Toledo Natural Gas Trustees reported that the city owned eighty-five wells, seventy-three miles of pipe outside of the city, and ninety-one inside of it. In the early Eighteen-Nineties the rates charged by the municipal company were from one-third to one-half less than those charged by the private companies. Even after the dwindling supply of natural gas in the city wells forced a curtailment in service, the simple presence of a plant which could be used for distributing artificial gas acted as a regulator on the rate policy of the old companies.

Toledo won the first round in this fight against privilege because an aroused people proved themselves stronger and more resourceful than an intrenched monopoly. The people were united because the arrogant behavior of the two private companies had alienated the conservative support they might otherwise have mustered by posing as the defenders of private enterprise. In this instance hatred of the oil trust was a stronger sentiment than fear of "municipal socialism." One reason why public opinion was more solidly in favor of the municipal gas plant than it was later to be for municipalization of the street railway system was that in the gas war the corporations attacked by the city were largely financed by outside capital while in the street railway controversy in both Toledo and Cleveland the corporations under fire were locally owned. Consequently the

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 366.

street railways had numerous local allies, but the only friends the gas companies had were their newspaper, their lawyers, and the few citizens who let themselves be bribed by special rates.

Fight to Retain the Gas Plant

BY THE TIME of Golden Rule Jones' second administration as mayor a change had been worked in Toledo's attitude toward the city natural gas plant. No longer was it regarded as a wise and prudent investment, a proof of civic strength. Now it was almost universally pointed to as an extravagant folly, a symbol of municipal incompetence. The chief reason for this startlingly altered opinion was the depletion of the wells on which the city relied for its supply of gas. As we have seen this was largely caused by the old companies' policy of pumping heavily from wells on land adjacent to the city's gas property. In every contest with the private companies to obtain new gas land the city gas trustees were under a disadvantage. To meet the requirements of the law the trustees had to work slowly and in public. But their rivals could make instant decisions and obtain secret options. Yet even if the city had had more success in obtaining new gas wells, the situation would have been only temporarily eased. The northern Ohio natural gas fields were declining in commercial importance. Henceforth the natural gas companies which served Toledo would draw more and more on gas piped from West Virginia fields, meeting the expense of the longer haul by selling gas to municipalities along the route of the pipe line. It would have been both illegal and impracticable for the city to have done this.[5]

Jones proposed that the city sell the now superfluous pipe lines outside the city, retain the distributing system within the city, and use the proceeds of the sale of the outside pipe lines to erect a plant for the manufacture of artificial gas.[6] His suggestion found little favor. The Council was reactionary and corrupt; the newspapers were unfriendly to Jones and suspicious of his "visionary" ideas; and except for a small body of radicals, public opinion was apathetic. The lagging interest of the people is shown by the comparatively unnoticed abandonment of the city's suit against the Standard Oil Company in 1898. This suit had been instituted five years

[5] On the city's disadvantage in the struggle for new gas lands see the editorial, "Another 'Tainted News' Output," *The Public*, vol. XIII, pp. 1058–59 (November 11, 1909).

[6] Jones' recommendations regarding the disposition of the natural gas plant are found in two of his annual messages to the Council. These are printed in Toledo, "Annual Statement. . . for the Year Ending April 1, 1898" and Toledo, "Annual Statement. . . for the Year Ending April 1, 1900."

before to collect one million dollars in damages for the loss occasioned Toledo by the methods allegedly used by the company to harass the building of the municipal gas plant.[7]

Ever since the failure of the gas supply the newspapers had been calling the pipe line a white elephant and demanding the sale of the entire system to "stop the loss." Taxpayers were not allowed to forget that the annual interest payment on the natural gas bonds amounted to almost fifty thousand dollars. The papers could see no virtue in Jones' proposal which appeared to them as only one more attempt to get the city to sink more money in an enterprise which they now thought should not have been undertaken in the first place.

The Council added to the fiction of the failure of municipal ownership by conducting inconclusive investigations of the conduct of the city gas trustees. When it could find no graft, this body whose scant reputation for either probity or ability made ludicrous its presumption to investigate anything or anybody, professed to find evidence of inefficiency in the operation of the plant.

To all of these cries for the surrender of the municipal gas enterprise Jones replied that no one was going to buy the gas plant just to take a white elephant off the city's hands. Somebody, he said, is going to make a profit out of it. He stressed the value of the plant both for the opportunity it gave the city of engaging in another adventure in co-operative business, and also as a weapon to keep the old companies in line.[8] But Golden Rule Jones' voice was drowned in the clamor of the practical and economic-minded men of business who insisted on the sale of the whole plant.

"Giving Away" the Gas Plant

THE TOLEDO COUNCIL was so anxious to get rid of the municipal gas system that it practically gave it away. The first part of the much-maligned property to be discarded was the outside pipe line which was sold for junk in 1899. Two years later the plant inside the city was leased to a private company at a rental which proved insufficient to meet the annual bill for lighting the municipal buildings.

Fearing that something like this might happen, Jones had induced some friends to offer $300,000 for the system on a lease arrangement which

[7] For Lloyd's protest against the dropping of this law suit see his letter to Jones in Caro Lloyd, "Henry Demarest Lloyd" (2 vols., New York, 1912), vol. II, pp. 142–43.

[8] Jones' reply to demands for the sale of the plant is found in his message to Council printed in the "Annual Statement" for 1898 and 1900.

would have allowed the city to resume control of the plant at any time it desired. This bid was rejected by the Council in July, 1899.[9] In October Jones repeated his recommendation that the outside pipe line be sold and that the city use the proceeds of the sale to build an artificial gas plant. Instead, under a suspension of the rules, the Council passed a resolution directing the City Clerk to advertise for bids on both parts of the gas system. The procedure was somewhat as if a councilman had quietly moved that the clerk advertise the City Hall for sale.[10] The successful bidder was the firm of Kerlin Brothers which in December, 1899 offered $102,000 for the outside pipe line and $126,000 for the inside plant. Attached to their bid for the inside part of the system was the condition that the Council grant the purchaser a perpetual franchise to sell gas in the city and that it (the Council) also agree to establish gas rates acceptable to the company. This sale to the Kerlin Brothers was invalidated by the Lucas County Common Pleas Court on May 9, 1900, but was allowed to take effect in regard to the pipe line outside the city by the State Circuit Court later in the same year.[11]

Jones characterized the sale as "the struggle to obtain private possession of the people's property. . . . The battle of the few to gain and keep possession of the property of the many."[12] Both the *Blade* and the *Bee* condemned the sale, not because they were in favor of permanently retaining any part of the plant, but because they thought the price offered by the Kerlins was too low. In a dissenting opinion in the Circuit Court case which had allowed the Kerlins to take the outside pipe line, Justice Hull stated that the evidence presented to the court showed that the pipe line was worth $225,000 at the very lowest estimate. Since the Kerlins got it for $102,000, or at less than half price, they seem to have been voted a gift of at least $123,000 worth of property.

The fact that in December the Council had accepted $72,000 less for the plant than it had been offered in July gave credence to the suspicion that it had been bribed. It was common knowledge that scarcity of pipe had increased the junk value of the city pipe line from forty to sixty per cent in the five months between July and December. The deal was customarily referred to in the papers as "the pipe line grab." Yet, as far

[9] See *Toledo Blade*, July 10, 12, 18, 19, 1899.

[10] This was pointed out by Justice Hull in a dissenting opinion in Kerlin Brothers Co. *v.* The City of Toledo, 20, Ohio Circuit Court Reports, 603.

[11] The two decisions are reported in 8 Ohio Nisi Prius Reports 62 and 20 Ohio Circuit Reports 603. In the report of the latter case there is a convenient chronology of the sale.

[12] Quoted in the *Toledo Blade* April 12, 1900.

as we can tell, public opinion seems not to have been greatly aroused.[13] The people were accustomed to think of their council as corrupt; they had been conditioned to think of the municipal gas plant, for which they had worked so hard, as a failure. They loved Jones for his goodness and on election day were always ready to stand up with him against the politicians. But their wisest, soundest, most successful men had told them over and over again that in matters affecting the business of the community Jones was an impractical dreamer. His talk about brotherhood was all right only as long as he wasn't permitted to apply it. The people had heard this so much that perhaps they had come to believe it was true.

If the people were indifferent there was at least one important influence in the political life of the city which was strongly in favor of the sale of the gas plant to the Kerlins. That was the electric railway and light company which was trying to get its contract for lighting the streets renewed at the same time the Kerlins were attempting to get the gas plant. Jones had opposed the renewal of the lighting contract and sought instead to have the city build an electric power plant to produce its own electricity for lighting the streets. Manifestly it was to the electric company's interest to discredit all efforts at municipal ownership. After the sale of the gas plant had been completed a councilman named Meissner testified in court that he had been approached by an official of the railway and light company and offered one thousand dollars if he would vote in favor of the sale. The official allegedly told the councilman that the reason for the company's generosity was that it wanted the support of the "Kerlin men" in council on the matter of renewing the lighting contract. "The money is going round," he said, "and you might as well get yours."[14] Significantly enough the Council renewed the city's lighting contract with the electric company and accepted the Kerlin's bid for the gas plant at the same meeting.[15] Several weeks later, again at the same meeting, the Council passed both measures over Jones' veto.[16]

Liquidating the "White Elephant"

BECAUSE OF THE CIRCUIT COURT'S DECISION in the Kerlin case Toledo was still possessed of the inside gas plant. On August 19, 1901, the

[13] One indignation meeting is reported in the *Blade*, December 16, 1899.

[14] The trial of the man accused of attempting to bribe Meissner dragged on for eight years. Indicted three times, he was finally acquitted in 1908. For the history of the case and an account of the trial, see *The Toledo News-Bee*, March 7, 1908.

[15] Reported *Toledo Blade*, December 12, 1899.

[16] *Ibid.*, January 9, 1900.

Council disposed of this property in a characteristic fashion. Unanimously and without debate it leased to the Toledo Gas Light and Coke Company at an annual rental of $6,500 and authorized the company to charge ninety-five cents per thousand cubic feet for illuminating gas and seventy-five cents per thousand cubic feet for fuel gas. In doing this the Council ignored a bid which offered a higher rental and lower rates.[17]

This was the way the Council, nominated by the parties and elected by the men who claimed to want a business-like administration, liquidated Toledo's white elephant."Very funny if you find such things amusing," says a disgruntled young woman in a recent play. The story of the Toledo natural gas plant is a comedy if lost opportunity and enthusiasm changed to disillusion strike us as amusing. From the Civic Revivalist's viewpoint it was not funny because the supposed failure of the municipal gas enterprise blighted other attempts at municipal ownership in Toledo and was used as an object lesson to discourage other cities from undertaking the municipalization of public utilities.[18] To the student of privilege the Toledo gas war is instructive chiefly because of the concrete examples it provides of how privilege fights. In a broad sense the Civic Revivalists thought the first half of the story shows what the people can do when they are aroused; the second half is a warning of what privilege can do while the people sleep.

The Ice Monopoly Case

IT IS SCARCELY NECESSARY to note the indispensability to a city of a cheap supply of ice in the days before electric refrigeration was common. A necessity as well as a convenience in homes, restaurants, saloons, dairies, and butcher shops, its cost was an important problem to the city-dweller. Realizing this, Frederic C. Howe had suggested that cities insure themselves a cheap supply of ice by establishing their own artificial ice plants.

In the summer of 1906 cities in the eastern and central states were swept by a wave of revolt against the high prices charged for ice by dealers who claimed that an "ice famine" of the winter before necessitated the increase. The uprising took various forms in different cities, ranging from criminal prosecutions of ice merchants in some to attempts to set up municipal ice plants in others.[19] These separate movements against local

[17] Reported, *The Toledo Bee*, August 20, 1901.

[18] For an example of how the gas plant was used to discredit municipal ownership see "Toledo's Experience with Municipal Ownership," *Public Policy*, vol. IX, pp. 121–22. (September 5, 1903).

[19] Sterling Beeson, "Prosecuting the Ice Men," *The World Today*, vol. XI, pp. 939–43 (September, 1906), summarizes the almost nation-wide crusade against the ice trusts.

trusts occurred at about the same time that the federal government was extending and increasing its use of the federal anti-trust laws. Most of the demonstrations against the ice trusts were inspired by newspapers. The excitement raged through the early months of the summer. Then the dramatic murder of Stanford White by Harry Thaw pushed the ice barons out of the news.

Exposure of the Ice Trust

TOLEDO, WHICH WAS A distributing point for ice gathered from the important natural ice fields of Michigan, took the lead in the criminal prosecution of the ice trusts. In March, 1906 ice prices in Toledo had been doubled. As in other cities the local companies gave the small yield of ice the previous winter as the cause of the increase. The exposure of the ice trust in Toledo was largely the work of the *Toledo News-Bee*, a vigorous Scripps-McRae paper edited by Negley D. Cochran. Beginning on April 30, 1906 and continuing through the first week of May the *News-Bee* printed a series of articles by H. G. Beach, a man of wide experience in various phases of the ice business. Beach showed that the yield of ice from the Michigan fields in 1906 had been an average one. He asked why an important artificial ice company had raised its prices at the same time that the price of natural ice went up. In a suggestive article on May 2 he indicated the connection between the largest local ice company and the railroad which controlled shipments between the city and the ice field.

Other writers in the *News-Bee* embellished Beach's stories by accounts of the heartlessness of the local trust. The manager of an artificial ice company was reported to have stated in an interview that how much his company could get for ice was a more important consideration in fixing prices than the cost of manufacture. This would have passed for sound business reasoning a few years before but with the awakening social sense of the Progressive era it was regarded as one more proof of corporate villainy. The *News-Bee* quoted a physician who believed the business practices of the trust menaced the health of the community. The companies in the trust refused to sell ice to any one who did not purchase a five dollar sheaf of ice tickets, thus preventing the poor from getting ice. A woman told a reporter that her family would have gone without ice if a kindly saloon keeper had not sold her small blocks from his supply.

Using evidence turned up by the *News-Bee*, Lyman W. Wachenheimer, Prosecuting Attorney of Lucas County, secured the indictment of the

A less complete account of the movement is the editorial, "Getting After the Icemen," *Everybody's Magazine*, vol. XV, p. 563 (October, 1906).

managers of five local ice companies. They were accused of conspiracy in restraint of trade in violation of the Valentine Act, Ohio's anti-trust law. Wachenheimer, a former Democrat, had once been a judge of the Toledo Police Court. In this position he had gained some notoriety by fining Mayor Jones for contempt of court. Later he found himself being converted to some of Jones' principles and in 1905 he campaigned with Whitlock as an Independent.

Early in June the first of the defendants to be tried in the ice monopoly case was found guilty. Then the other defendants changed their pleas to guilty and awaited the sentence of the court. This was not an uncommon proceeding in prosecutions under the Valentine Act because the typical sentence was a fine which the defendant's employer was usually willing to pay. On June 25, 1906 Judge R. B. Kinkade of the Lucas County Common Pleas Court broke away from the tradition. For the first time in any case involving an infraction of an anti-trust law, jail terms were imposed as penalties on the convicted offenders. Judge Kinkade sentenced each of the five ice merchants to serve a year in prison and to pay a fine of five thousand dollars, the heaviest punishment provided for in the Valentine Act.[20]

Toledo was astounded at the severity of the sentence. Five prominent businessmen sentenced just like ordinary criminals! The imprisonment of the ice men was hailed as a popular victory and a vindication of justice. Only Brand Whitlock, then mayor of Toledo, thought of the hundreds of other men, poor men, whose imprisonment caused no sensation. Yet without for a moment expecting that the evils of monopoly would be remedied by criminal statutes and prosecutions, he could understand the average Toledoan's feeling of pride in what had been accomplished. Characteristically he credited the victory to the rise of the independent spirit in Toledo. He thought that the reason "the system" had failed to protect the ice men was that Toledo was fortunate enough to have a newspaper and some officials who represented the people rather than privilege. The *News-Bee*, Judge Kinkade, and Prosecutor Wachenheimer were all independent in politics. Having no obligations to any party organization, each was free to do his duty as he saw fit.[21]

The theory behind the prosecution and sentencing of the ice monopolists was that the fear of imprisonment would make businessmen be good.

[20] Reported in *The Toledo News-Bee*, June 25, 1906. Several days later Judge Kinkade reduced the sentence to six months imprisonment and fines of $2,500.

[21] For Whitlock's interpretation of the ice monopoly case see "Trust Men Go To Jail," *Collier's, the National Weekly*, vol. XXXVII, p. 15 (July 14, 1906).

An editorial in a popular magazine commented favorably on the decisions rendered in some of the anti-trust cases being heard in courts all over the country: "The most encouraging feature about these prosecutions is that they have resulted in several sentences of imprisonment. It may be expected that men will take the chances of a fine in order to get the chances of a large profit. But the hazard of imprisonment they will be more slow to take."[22]

At least in the Toledo ice case later developments were to show that the "hazard of imprisonment" was slight. When they pleaded guilty the ice men had expected to be fined. Surprised at the sentence Judge Kinkade actually meted out to them, they tried to obtain new trials at which they intended to plead not guilty. Denied this, their lawyers appealed their cases first to the Circuit Court and then to the State Supreme Court. The only change the latter tribunal made in the decision was to order that imprisonment should be in the county jail rather than in the city workhouse.[23] Naturally these appeals, although fruitless, had taken considerable time. Consequently it was not until almost two years after their original conviction that the ice men went to jail. A month later, having served a total of thirty-seven days, their sentences were suspended and they were released from prison.[24] There was no protest against this from city officials, the newspapers, or from the public. The humiliation of the ice merchants had appeased the resentment of the community against them.

One of the signers of the petition asking that the sentences be suspended was Brand Whitlock. He must have smiled when he signed it, remembering the outraged protest every manifestation of his charitable attitude toward "ordinary criminals" drew from respectable society. However, it is probable that he was glad to endorse this appeal for mercy. He must have felt it was a demonstration of his contention that while the desire for revenge is strong in human hearts, the impulse for mercy is more abiding. The people of Toledo were ready to forgive the ice men because, despite their first anger, they could understand their crime. These men were their sort and the people could sympathize with them and their families. "How long," Whitlock wondered, sometimes with a quickening of hope, and again in the shadow of the despair that was eventually to engulf him, "how long will it take us to find out for ourselves what Jones tried to show us: Good men and bad, we are *all* the same sort; guilty of

[22] "More Criminal Cases Against Corporations," *The Outlook*, vol. LXXXIII, p. 535 (July 7, 1906).

[23] Lemmon *v.* The State of Ohio, 77 Ohio State 427.

[24] Reported, *The Toledo News-Bee*, March 7, 1908.

the same crimes, worthy of the same mercy, all needful of the same kindness."

Results of the Prosecutions

THE TOLEDO ICE PROSECUTIONS humiliated five men and their families and increased the prestige of the prosecuting attorney and the judge who heard the case. It gave the people of Toledo a chance to vent their anger, and later to display their generosity. It resulted in the temporary lowering of ice prices in Toledo, not because the conditions which had made possible the original combination were eradicated, but because an independent dealer found that it was good business, for the time being, to cut prices. We must remember, of course, that the men convicted were not the "ice trust." They were employees of several companies whose officers had entered into an agreement to raise the price of ice by pretending that there was little of that commodity to be had. Two of the men originally convicted were employed by companies which were as much victims of the trust as was the public. These two firms purchased their ice from other members of the combine at wholesale prices fixed by the combine. The prosecution did not touch the railroads who controlled the transit of ice from the Michigan fields and whose rate policy was therefore an important factor both in determining the price of ice in Toledo and in making possible (through favoritism) the establishment of the local monopoly.[25]

As in the Toledo monopoly case, later criminal prosecutions of individuals under the State and Federal anti-trust laws have shown that the possibility of imprisoning businessmen for trust crimes is not ordinarily very large. Even if the threat of imprisonment were greater it is doubtful if it would prevent the rise of monopoly when combination is felt to be an economic necessity and when skilled lawyers are available to defend the monopolist. But while criminal prosecutions have not destroyed monopoly nor prevented its growth, they have made privileged businesses better behaved, more anxious to obtain and preserve the good will of the public. In this sense, and in this limited way, public opinion acts as a regulator of monopoly.

One writer reflects on the irony that "the automobile could do more to kill rule by traction rings than all the campaigning and speechmaking in the world."[26] Similarly if the ice trusts had been as influential a force

[25] *The Toledo News-Bee*, June 29, 1906 comments on the rôle of the railroad companies in the ice trust case.

[26] John Chamberlain, "Farewell to Reform" (New York, 1933), pp. 74–5.

in city councils as the traction interests were, we might expect that the spread of electric refrigeration would have destroyed their grip on city politics. But it is important for us to notice that such technological improvements as the automobile and the electric refrigerator do not end monopoly in industries which are based upon law-made privilege or control of the supply of a natural commodity. Private street railway companies maintain their monopoly of city public transportation even if they have substituted buses for street cars and even if the control of the companies is in the hands of the banks. Certain ice and fuel companies have continued their strangle hold on the ice business even though their market has been restricted. In these industries monopoly has persisted but it is less noticeable that it used to be for, at least until very recently, it touches fewer people than formerly. Especially in the case of ice it effects the poorer and presumably less influential, less articulate classes of the population.

Ohio State University

NOTE: The prosecution of a large number of lumber and brick dealers in Toledo in 1907 paralleled the ice case in many ways. See *Toledo Blade*, July 12, 1907; Edward E. Arnsman *et al v.* The State of Ohio, 11 Ohio Circuit Court Reports, New Series, 113; and "Prison Sentences for Trust Crimes," *The Public*, vol. X, pp. 368–9, (July 20, 1907).

The Basis of Scientific Land Reform

LAND TITLES and tenure must be respected for countless reasons but we will find, if we trace back far enough, that land titles rest on (1) grants from some long-dead king, who no more owned the land than did the man in the moon; (2) seizure by force from former owners who were usually slaughtered in the process; (3) fraud; (4) just getting there first and beating the other fellow to it. It is my profound conviction that the land was put here for the use of all men and not for just a favored few of each generation.

Is it not preposterous that men born upon this earth are denied access to the land (on which and from which all must live, and without which life would be impossible,) except on payment of tribute to other men whose claims are based on favoritism, force, fraud or the fortuitous circumstance of "getting there first"? It would be no more ridiculous to say that Adam might have claimed all the earth as his own, entailing its ownership so that today the whole earth would be owned by one man who could exact payment from other men for permission to use it or, if he chose, banish them altogether from the face of the earth.

The public collection of ground rent does not imply the "dividing up" of the land. The user's right of continuous and exclusive possession of his land is just as vital as is his right to the product of his labor. Human needs and wants vary; human ways of life are diverse. There are ten-talent men and one-talent men; some can use much land, others but little. Some, like the man who lived on the third floor and worked on a ferry-boat, imagine they have no need for land. But waterways themselves are land in the economic sense, as are terminals and apartment houses. All material things that men need originate in the land. Denied access to the land, men must die.

The one just way of sharing equitably the patrimony of all men is by the collection from each of fair payment, as determined in the open market, for the advantage he enjoys in the use of a particular location; the funds thus derived to be used in public benefits and services. There is no more necessity for dividing up the land than for the stockholders of a railroad to apportion the physical assets of the road among themselves, one taking a car, another a piece of a locomotive, a third a few rails.

Let each individual hold as little or as much land as he is willing to pay for in ground rent to the community. Such a land-tenure policy is sometimes called a "tax on land values." The term, however, is inaccurate, since a tax is "a compulsory exaction for the support of the government" while ground rent is merely payment for value received.

This proposal would leave to the producer the fruits of his toil, his right to which is outrageously violated by our present tax system. It would leave to the community that value which could never have come into being save by the establishment and growth of the community, the rental value of land.

Our present system of land tenure is a double imposition on the people at large. First, it permits ground rent to be taken by private landowners instead of requiring that it be collected by the government for the equal benefit of all citizens. The citizens can be benefited equitably only by having government expenses paid from this ground-rent fund instead of from the earnings of producers. Second, our present system is largely responsible for the withholding of high-grade lands from use or from their best use, forcing the use of inferior land and thus lowering the level of production and general standards of living.

To the producer belongs the product. To all men equally belongs the rent of land.

JOHN C. LINCOLN

Cleveland, O.

• REVIEWS •

Philosophy for Social Inquiry

By HORACE S. FRIES

NOBODY TODAY DENIES the utility of the social sciences. If one were inclined to do so, the military expenditures of the federal government on social inquiry would silence him at once. Yet the pick-up in "business" occasioned by the war in Korea and the general threat it entails, serves only to put off a pervasive restlessness or uneasiness among the more thoughtful inquirers within the ranks.

The concrete difficulties which make for the underlying uncertainties about social inquiry are easy to discern. In the first place the rapidly expanded activities of social science during the great depression and the second world war bore practically no fruit in the way of sound theoretical progress. Secondly, although we may claim to have won some very important practical techniques for controlling economic conditions within very narrow limiting conditions, research activities since the war have apparently accomplished nothing in the way of removing the basic social difficulties which lead to war, not to mention other increasing social tensions. It looks as though the more social problems we "solve" the more difficult it becomes to reach real solutions. Even those who profess loudly a complete separation between theory and practice can hardly fail to be concerned about the situation, although they may loudly profess that it is *merely* a practical concern to keep "pure" social science alive. Indeed, a cynical theorist might find a superficial parallel between this development in the social area and an apparently corresponding development in the physical sciences. He might argue, for example, that the progress of physics has resulted in both a multiplication of new problems and an increasing difficulty in answering basic physical questions.

For the sake of examining this apparent parallel between social and physical inquiry let us suppose for the moment that the claim about the physical sciences is legitimate. Even so, and even supposing a complete separation of theory, yet the parallel breaks down. For as physical science develops there is no corresponding difficulty in solving the practical physical problems—that is, technological problems—which arise. The progress of the physical sciences is doubtless a factor in the general breakdown

of social processes today. But no one will argue that it is our failure to solve technological problems (in the sense of the problems of the applied physical sciences) which is involved in the breakdown. Quite the contrary indeed! It is usually technological progress which is made the scapegoat, even by some social scientists.

Outside the ranks of cynics and pure opportunists among social scientists this disturbing situation has led many inquirers to become more reflective about the foundations and *basic* methods in the social area.[1] In other words, the growing difficulties have given rise to philosophical interests within the various disciplines. It even goes so far as to lead some social scientists to turn to professional philosophy for suggestions or assistance.

Unfortunately, the highly specialized and technical nature of most recent professional philosophical discourse makes it unsuited to perform this important function of aiding social inquiry. And interestingly enough, (as far as my own limited observations go) those philosophers who are found to be most helpful to the social scientist are thinkers whose influence for the time is waning in professional philosophical circles. I have in mind Mead, Whitehead, and Dewey.[2] This remark is not made as a reflection on the social sciences. Quite the contrary. In so far as the observation is true, it is a reflection on current trends in professional philosophy.

However, our concern here is not with professional philosophical circles, but with philosophy for social inquiry. But the observation I have made does have a bearing on what I want to suggest, as will later be pointed out.

It was mentioned above that the concrete difficulties blocking social inquiry are clearly evident. Unfortunately, however, theoretical understanding of these factors is entirely absent. Yet it would seem that until social theory can understand its own deficiencies it can hardly be expected to understand the difficulties which give rise to war and increasing social disintegration generally.

No one can know *a priori* the precise nature of the inhibiting factors. But the least that can be expected is a theory which gives some kind of guidance to a conscientious search for them—other than an appeal to "original sin" or some other scape-goat. Now it seems to me that such a theory is at hand, but unfortunately, it is either unknown or not sufficiently understood among social scientists to be put to work by them on

[1] George R. Geiger, "Philosophy and the Social Order: An Introductory Approach," (Houghton Mifflin Co., 1947).

[2] I would greatly appreciate it if social scientists would send me their own observations as they bear on this one.

this task and others. The proposal I wish to make is one for the further clarification of this theory among social inquirers. But before making the suggestion, it may be helpful to notice one factor, which according to this theory, is a crucial block.

To conscientious social scientists who do not have some special theoretical axe to grind or some other vested interest in the status quo of social inquiry, to these it is surely a reflection on their subject that the federal government spends practically nothing on research to aid policy formulation. Of course, in practice, whatever we may claim in theory, inquiry which actually throws much light on the implementation of policy is bound to throw light indirectly, by reflection, on policy formulation. For example, some errors in policy making are bound to be discovered in efforts at implementation. But it would be much less costly to the country and to the world if a concerted research effort were made to avoid these and other errors at the outset in the process of policy formulation. Yet the government can hardly be blamed for not undertaking research in this area when the prevailing belief among social scientists seems to be that policy formulation, or evaluative activities, fall outside the sphere of science.

The dilemma involved is genuine, and is clearly expressed in the following passage from an eminent social planner.

> A clear distinction ought to be made between what people want and what they need. It is legitimate criticism of such studies as have been made by Stuart Chase that they take as a starting point, not what people *want*, but what an impartial commentator thinks they *ought* to want. . . . The only practicable method of handling an investigation of the industrial system today is to assume that people are entitled to want what they actually do want; and to define economic efficiency as giving people what they want. Anything else involves deciding (and ultimately trying to tell people) what they ought to want, which becomes tyranny pure and simple.[3]

Here then is the dilemma: if science takes on the prerogative of policy making, it becomes dictatorial in legislating for the desires of human beings. Hence it must avoid policy. But if policy formulation is not enlightened, what is there to keep us from drifting into a dictatorship; or for that matter, what is to keep people from wanting dictatorship? Indeed, among those who wanted and who now want dictatorship (perhaps in preference to "lesser evils") are many apparently "enlightened" people. The planner quoted above sees clearly that planning and effective social inquiry aim to provide for the fulfillment of the desires of people and that these are not to be confused with the "neutral" or "authoritarian" judgment of the

[3] Adolf Berle, "New Directions in the New World," (Harper & Brothers, 1940), pp. 70–1.

inquirer as to "what they ought to want." What he fails to see, however, is that there is no escaping the responsibility of choosing among wants. For any activity of providing for desires will frustrate or eliminate some, satisfy others, and create new ones.

The theory which I am suggesting should be clarified and developed for social inquiry, has this advantage: that it professes to avoid the dilemma of dictatorship by science versus dictatorship by drift. For it proposes a fundamental reconstruction of the two traditional philosophical concepts which, according to the theory, generate the dilemma; namely, the concepts of science and evaluation. After the work of Dewey, Mead, Otto, and other instrumentalists and pragmatists, it is a simple matter to state abstractly the revised concepts. But it is equally evident that they have not been stated with sufficient clarity to get themselves tried out on any extensive scale in social inquiry. Certainly this theory cannot be proved before it is tried out. But equally certainly it has not been disproved, for the simple reason that it has not been clearly enough understood to have been tried and found wanting.

In general, the theory referred to simply takes seriously in its logic of inquiry the knowledge now available in biology, psychology, and anthropology about human activities. Problems are not "handed out" as eternal forms to be "grasped" by an "inner mind's eye" and solved either by systematic observation or by a faculty of "pure reason." On the contrary, they are *formulated* in the course of human practice and inquiry, and the most crucial phase of inquiry is the manner in which they are formulated. As long as their formulation is taken as falling outside the process of deliberate inquiry, it will be an accidental formulation. In this case it is hardly surprising that the "solution" of social problems simply complicates the social scene and makes it progressively more difficult to reach real solutions. At the very least, the theory in question recognizes that the formulation of social difficulties into problems is itself a problem which perhaps can be solved by learning how to formulate them so as to make progressive solutions and resolutions possible.[4]

Accordingly, if my claims about the theory are true, an intelligent step for conscientious social inquirers would be to agree, at least tentatively, with instrumentalism that as yet the answers to our dilemma are not known. If we could once attain to the level of genuine Socratic acknowledgment of ignorance, we might then begin to find some formulations and

[4] Horace S. Fries, "Logical Simplicity: A Challenge to Philosophy and to Social Inquiry," *Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 17, pp. 207–28 (July, 1950); see also an essay, "Perception and Value Inquiry," to be published in this JOURNAL.

answers. For what Dewey remarked years ago is even truer today: that the main block to understanding and using constructively a theory which at least gives some promise of an experimental unification of theory and practice is the carry-over of inherited, and for the most part, unrecognized basic beliefs about what knowledge or science is; and that this unfortunate inheritance shows up fatally in the practice of accepting problems as given instead of recognizing the responsibility in inquiry of formulating the problem.

Part one of Geiger's book, *Philosophy and the Social Order: An Introductory Approach,* gives a clear statement of the fields and problems of traditional philosophy. Unfortunately, as it seems to me, the traditional problems are stated only in their logical form without sufficient attention to the relevant cultural factors which gave rise to the problems. Presumably a social inquirer, in lieu of a philosophy instructor, can supply those conditions for himself. But the heart of the book lies in Chapter 5 of Part One, which is an instrumentalist analysis of reflective thinking and therefore of the basis of science, and in Part Two where the instrumentalist approach is expounded in logical clarity and in concrete application to pressing social problems. From Part One, the reader can learn that neither philosophy nor social science has the answers. From Part Two he can learn how to begin to ask social questions in such a way that the answers can be progessively discovered.

The titles and section heads in Part Two speak for themselves. Chapter 6, "Scientific Method and Values"; Chapter 7, "Toward an Objective Ethics"; Chapter 8, "Values and the Social Sciences."

The subheads and sections of the next chapter, "Some Problems of Political Philosophy," are as follows: "The Significance of Democracy: A Suggestion," "The Basic Assumptions of Democracy," "Democracy and Science," "Political Democracy," "The Laissez-Faire State: Historical Background," "The Laissez-Faire State: Economic Postulates," "The Laissez-Faire State: Political Postulates," "The Liberal-Democratic State: Negative and Positive," "Human Rights: As Natural and Metaphysical," "Human Rights: As Ethical Concepts." In this chapter abstract philosophical questions about the basis of democracy are expounded in terms of concrete examples of specific rights and duties.

The next chapter in Part Two, "Economics and a Democratic Society," faces up to the problem of democratic planning and evaluates specific concrete suggestions. Following this is a chapter on "Philosophy and Education" which clearly reveals the basic educational issue of the day, the meaning of a liberal education, and argues that education and scientific social

inquiry are inseparable. The concluding chapter, "Scientific Humanism," shows how a system of concepts based on an integration of science and value can provide "an adequate intellectual foundation for a new recovery of nerve." This is to be attained through acknowledgment of men's responsibility to reap for themselves whatever harvest is to be reaped, and it is to be justified by a faith in the use and expansion of scientific intelligence linked logically with a moral concern to enrich human life to the utmost.

The neglect of Mead, Whitehead, and instrumentalism in current professional philosophical discourse is naturally reflected to some extent in the reception Geiger's book has had in professional philosophical circles. Under the circumstances, I am sorry to have to confess, this is a compliment to the book and a reflection on current professional philosophical activity. Dewey himself has recently observed that the state of philosophy has probably not been at such a low ebb in fifty years as at present.[5]

It is easy to understand why Geiger's book is not popular in professional philosophical circles (although truth to say, no single book here now maintains more than a very temporary and fad-like stand). Traditional philosophy is in the same predicament as traditional social inquiry with the additional handicap, if handicap it be, that it does not even have the immediate, short-range utility which the other social sciences indubitably possess. It is not an accident, however, that Geiger's book contains useful wisdom for social scientists since he came into philosophy years ago through the social sciences without ever really leaving the latter. Thus, his own experience exemplifies a unity of philosophy and social inquiry.

The clarity and fundamental soundness of *Philosophy and the Social Order* make it an invaluable philosophical tool for social inquiry. It is my deep conviction that once the ground is cleared, in the thinking of responsible social scientists, of the underbrush of culturally inherited philosophical beliefs, they can, with the incidental aid of instrumentalist philosophies, establish social science on the same firm foundation which has given the physical sciences their indelible self-corrective trait.

University of Wisconsin

[5] See also Albury Castell, "Philosophy," *The New International Yearbook*, 1950, (Funk and Wagnalls, 1950), pp. 424–6.

Who Makes Wars?

The Makers of War. By Francis Neilson. Appleton, Wis.: C. C. Nelson Publishing Co., 1950, 240 pp., biblio., index, $4.

Dr. Neilson has been a student of the process of war-making (and of the other side of the coin, the means by which peace can be maintained) since the beginning of the Boer War. After it, as a leading member of the Constitutional Radical wing of the British Liberal party and as a member of Parliament, he fought indefatigably against the chain of circumstances that led to the first world war.

When the war was declared, he wrote "How Diplomats Make War." This set off the "literature of the Great Disillusionment," that notable series of investigations and analyses of the causes of World War I. In the course of a decade this body of works countered the criminal hate propaganda of the governments during the war and the popular ignorance of foreign affairs exploited by the propagandists. Between the months of August and December, 1914, he produced this work, a classic now in its fifth printing in English and available in the chief languages of the world.

His book written, he gave testimony to the sincerity of his convictions by resigning in protest from parliament. Ending his political career in his native England, he returned to America. But his career as a democratic reformer was not ended. His effort to press the basic issues of war and peace has been one of the chief interests of his lifetime. To explode the Satanic Theory of war. To revive among the people consciousness of their responsibility to maintain the peace and of their ability to block the blunders, conspiracies and machinations through which nations drift into war. To end for all time the secret diplomacy by which politicians and privileged interests, sometimes unwittingly, set the stage for the booming of the cannon and the blasting of the bombs. These have been the goals of his effort, and no higher aims could command so talented a pen.

When Germany invaded Poland on Sept. 1, 1939, he began his diary of the second world war, "The Tragedy of Enrope." In its five volumes, continued until the last shot was fired, he presented not only a day-by-day analysis of the development of the conflict but a report on his life-long studies in the origins of international carnage. That war was followed by a period without even the illusion of international peace. With the nations moving toward a third world war, the writings of virtually all the contemporary commentators on the late conflict, like the decisions of the western statesmen, have been exposed by iconoclastic history as banal and shallow stuff.

But not those of Dr. Neilson, who warned against the dark menace of Stalinism as early as October, 1939. That the political decisions of the great-power coalition against the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo alliance would destroy the *modus vivendi* on which the war-time coalition was based is a recurring theme in his five volumes. Nothing that is taking place today can surprise him, for he appraised correctly the consequences of the policies that, in time, produced the events.

Now, in "The Makers of War," he has built on the solid foundations of these empirical studies a logical structure which traces the development of the second world war through a chain of significant but little known circumstances. The first links consist of the slackness of trade in the English and continental dockyards in the Eighties and Nineties, the exchange of visits by the French and Russian fleets in 1892 and 1893 which did much to provoke the armaments race, and the beginning of the race in 1897. Further links are concerned with the Boer War and the fight to preserve Britain's gold and diamond interests, which left Britain without a friend in Europe. The Boer War and Britain's decline in industrial supremacy are followed further on in the chain by the Treaty of Algeciras, through which Britain, France and Spain sought in 1906 to entrench their interests in the Middle East and Africa and expand them at the expense of German interests. From Algeciras to Sarajevo and from Versailles to the Polish Corridor the trail is torturous; but for the discerning student of history, Dr. Neilson shows, the blazes are plain.

War is a phase, the climactic phase, of the politics of imperialism. Imperialism is the system by which the quasi-monopolies of the States with advanced economies assure themselves raw materials sources, investment opportunities and protected markets in the less developed States. The instruments of assurance in the days of open sterling, franc, mark, ruble and dollar imperialism were concession agreements. More recently they consist of treaties, agreements and declarations of policy with the force of national and international law.

Thus the history of peace and war is bound up with the negotiation of such instruments. Dr. Neilson emphasized this; but, unlike John A. Hobson, he is no economic determinist. (Hobson, indeed, considered war a "by-product" of imperialism and believed that in the present period, that of 'inter-imperialism,' war-making would be suspended by agreement; see especially his "Rationalization and Unemployment," (1930) pp. 114–7). The process by which peace is lost also includes sociological and political elements, Dr. Neilson demonstrates. The failure of the advanced States

to solve the problem of the business cycle, which produces mass unemployment, a phenomenon for which the only known antidote is war, is one of these forces, he argues. The key rôles that munitions industries play in those economies is another of these forces. Their influence is on the public subconscious; they temper the winds of opinion.

More, in scrapping the Great Man Theory of history, we have discarded with it a vital key to the understanding of history, the recognition that impersonal forces can operate only through human instruments whom they influence but cannot control. Thus, for the analysis of the process, Dr. Neilson shows, there are vital materials in the intrigues, conspiracies and blunderings of men high in the bureaucracies of politics, business, finance and journalism.

Dr. Neilson's analysis is an important contribution, and one of the purposes of his new book is to present an orderly exposition of it. But even more important is the companion purpose: to show the people how they lost control over the direction of foreign policy and how they can regain it. The book is addressed directly to the taxpayer and the elector. Dr. Neilson believes they will never get out of the present international political mess until they know how they got into it. They have to be provoked into finding out for themselves. No more provocative book has been written on the subject, and no more convenient guide to the primary materials for the inquiry.

"The Makers of War" is not a substitute for "How Diplomats Make War." It is a fitting companion volume to the established classic. The earlier book was written in the white heat of controversy; its pages sparkle with moral indignation, enlisting the citizen in the crusade for democratic control over the conduct of foreign policy. The present one, written thirty-five years after, brings the inquiry up to the invasion of Poland and demonstrates how the crusade can still be won. History has vindicated many of Dr. Neilson's judgments. His new book deserves to be read widely and considered carefully by intelligent citizens, who alone can end the repeated blundering which threatens to wreak havoc upon western civilization.

W. L.

Book and Monograph Notices

The Keys to Prosperity. By Willford I. King. New York 17: Committee for Constitutional Government, 1948, 242 pp., index, $4.

Professor King sets forth what he believes to be the essential measures to assure continuance of prosperity without sacrifice of liberty.

Estudios Economicos. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (Rua Santa Lucia, 735-12, andar). In Portuguese, quarterly. 40 cruzeiros annually.

The economics department of the Brazilian National Confederation of Industry has established this new quarterly economics journal. The first number contains 192 pages, devoted to studies in the estimation of national industrial production, Brazil's exchange problem, projects to deal with abuses of economic power and the Abbink report. Romulo Almeida, director of the department, and his collaborators merit congratulations on this constructive step.

Turkey: An Economic Appraisal. By Max W. Thornburg, Graham Spry and George Soule. New York: Twentieth Century Fund, 1949, 324 pp., index, $3.50.

This report was prepared after a research team, headed by Mr. Thornburg, visited Turkey to investigate how American investments and technical skills could best help the Turkish people to improve their economic well-being. It defines the possibilities but emphasizes that the Turks must put their house in order so that the economy is operated in the interest of the producers and consumers rather than of the bureaucrats.

Labor Relations in the Laundry Industry in Greater New York. By Louis Paul Nestel. New York, 14: Claridge Pub. Corp., 1950, 106 pp., index, $2.

Laundry workers have been among the most exploited workers in American industry. By labor organization (at first unsuccessful) and collective bargaining, some improvement in their situation has been obtained. Mr. Nestel presents a detailed and informed account of the process.

The Negro Newspaper. By Vishnu V. Oak. Yellow Springs, O.: Antioch Press, 1948, 170 pp., $2.50.

Dr. Oak is especially interested in business enterprises owned and operated by Negroes. In this first report on his studies, devoted to the Negro press in America, he presents a critical evaluation of the Negro newspaper, information on its functioning and its historical background and some suggestions for its improvement.

Expanding Welfare in a Free Economy. By Edna Lonigan. New York 17: American Enterprise Association, 1949, 44 pp., 50 cents.

Miss Lonigan urges voluntary welfare programs as an alternative to governmental programs.

Applied Economic Analysis. Edited by Francis M. Boddy. New York: Pitman Pub. Corp., 1948, 573 pp., index, $3.75.

A textbook for the problems part of the two-course undergraduate economics program, this work is composed of sections contributed by Boddy, Childs, Smith, Brownlee, Coons and Salera in their principal specialties. It attempts to cover a sufficient range of problems to give the students an understanding and appreciation of the economist's method of analyzing the probable effects of policy decisions.

Economia de la Sociedad Colonial: Ensayo de Historia Comparada de America Latina. By Sergio Bagu. Buenos Aires: Librería El Ateneo Editorial, 1949, 300 pp., biblio., glossary, index.

Señor Bagu presents an historical study of colonial and semi-colonial societies. The wide range of his investigation has resulted in an important contribution to Latin American studies of the regional situation.

State Taxation of Metallic Deposits. By Warren Aldrich Roberts. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 400 pp., $4.50.

By one of the quirks of magazine publishing, this book, scheduled for a major review when it first appeared in 1944, escaped notice. It is of special interest to the readers of this *Journal.* A case study in public finance, it is based on a keen appreciation of the fundamental economic issues in mine taxation. It is the most thorough original study of mineral economics and mine taxation to appear in recent years.

The Servile State. By Hilaire Belloc. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 189 pp.

The Restoration of Property. By Hilaire Belloc. New York: Sheed & Ward, 144 pp., $2.

These new American editions make Belloc's classics, well known to the readers of this *Journal,* more conveniently available.

The Theory of Wages. By J. R. Hicks. New York: Peter Smith, 1948, 247 pp.

The Social Framework of the American Economy. By J. R. Hicks and A. G. Hart. New York: Oxford Press, 1945, 261 pp., index, $2.50.

These are republications of Hicks's works, the first by facsimile reproduction, the second by adaptation of the British work to the American scene.

• COMMENT •

On Defeating the Communist Menace

FOR MORE THAN A DECADE the doctrine of interventionism has completely dominated United States' foreign policy and has brought us to the gravest crisis in our history. During the last war we were promised that defeat of the axis powers would usher in a period of peace and security. At the cost of over a million casualties and 341 billion dollars we beat Germany and Japan into unconditional surrender, and then peace and security seemed farther removed than ever. The fruits of "victory" have been a series of commitments that are growing more costly by the hour.

In order that Germany and Japan may become our allies, there is a clamor for reversal of our policy of keeping them down militarily to nonentities. In other words, our staunch allies today may be our bitter foes tomorrow, and vice versa. That is the inevitable result of letting ourselves be sucked into the maelstrom of old world diplomacy.

Once more we are engaged in a tremendous armament program to fight for freedom. This time the particular brand of dictatorship to be vanquished is communism. Will the program succeed? It is generally recognized that another war would be more likely to spread communism than to exterminate it, even though we should succeed in smashing Moscow's power completely, because another war will spread and intensify destruction, hunger and hopelessness, on which the Communist philosophy feeds. Neither will an intense armament race, with sporadic fighting at various points on a tremendously long perimeter, contain, much less defeat, communism.

According to General Omar Bradley, the program we are embarking on will last from ten to twenty years. Is anyone so naive as to believe that a generation can be reared in an atmosphere of complete government control without becoming indoctrinated with the poisonous tenets of totalitarianism? Temporary powers granted to the executive department of a government to meet emergencies have the disconcerting habit of hardening into permanent institutions. It is very probable that a more palatable name than communism will be applied when the increasing government controls have evolved into full-fledged dictatorship, but it will be synonymous with communism nevertheless.

Thus we are confronted with the serious dilemma that the more we spend to strengthen our position for a hot war, the more we weaken our position in the cold war. And it is the cold war that will in the long run decide the issue—communism or free enterprise? This dilemma must stem from social and economic maladjustments; that is, from infraction of some fundamental law pertaining to human relationships. It behooves us therefore to discover what the law is and endeavor to adjust our national and international affairs to comply with it.

Reasoning inductively from centuries of experience, the law of equal freedom, whereby men can work in co-operation under just conditions, has been formulated. It states very simply that man has freedom to do all that he wills provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other. This has also become known as the law of association in equality. From this generalization we may reason deductively and arrive at the rules governing specific cases.

Herbert Spencer, eminent British philosopher, applied this law to a very basic human relationship, namely, the right to the use of the earth. Chapter 9 of his book, "Social Statics", begins with:

> Given a race of beings having like claims to pursue the objects of their desires—given a world adapted to the gratification of those desires—a world into which such beings are similarly born, and it unavoidably follows that they have equal rights to the use of this world.

The chapter concludes with this pregnant statement:

> And we find lastly, that the theory of the co-heirship of all men to the soil, is consistent with the highest civilization; and that, however difficult it may be to embody that theory in fact, *Equity sternly commands it to be done.*

As we look over the world do we find generally any sincere, earnest effort to embody this theory in fact? Except for a couple of small countries whose influence is not sufficient to have any bearing on world events, the answer is definitely, "No." Indeed, the direction is rather the opposite; that is, towards monopolization of land rather than freeing it. Small wonder the world is in turmoil.

The dire consequences of failure to comply with this moral dictum are brought out in sharp relief by the mighty drama that has been unfolding in the Far East. Had the land and tax reforms begun by Sun Yat Sen more than 25 years ago been carried out, it is highly probable that China would not now be in the Russian orbit, and the problem of containing communism would be enormously simplified.

The London Times put the matter clearly and succinctly when it said:

The western powers cannot ignore the effective appeal which the native Communist leaders can make in the regions of southeast Asia where wars are now raging. The cry of land for the peasants and of independence for the peoples finds willing adherents, while far too often the western powers can be portrayed simply as upholding their own interests and maintaining the landlords in power.

How can the moral law of equal right to the use of the earth be complied with under complex modern conditions? It remained for the eminent American economist, Henry George, to supply the answer. In his famous classic, "Progress and Poverty," he has thoroughly analyzed the problem and arrived at a simple, practical and effective solution. The time has come to take Henry George's proposal for tax reform out of the realm of academic discussion and into the field of practical application.

The trend in Europe and United States has been to circumvent the law of equal freedom by innumerable palliatives paving the way for communism, such as social security, price and wage controls, subsidies, creation of jobs by public works, etc. The sorry plight of the world today bears ample testimony to the inadequacy of such measures. There is no substitute for justice.

KLAUS L. HANSEN

Milwaukee, Wis.

Contributors

WALTER G. O'DONNELL, M.A., member department of economics, Columbia University . . . RICHARD CLAUGHTON, New York critic . . . ELWOOD P. LAWRENCE, Ph.D., member, department of English, Michigan State College . . . JOHN HOPE II, specialist on industrial relations, Fisk University . . . JACQUES LACOUR-GAYET, member, Institute of France . . . ROBERT LACOUR-GAYET, chairman, department of history and government, St. John's University . . . WILL LISSNER, New York journalist . . . HOWARD BECKER, Ph.D., professor of sociology, University of Wisconsin . . . T. SWANN HARDING, B. S. Chem., special writer, U. S. Department of Agricuture . . . FRANCIS NEILSON, Litt.D., essayist and historian; former member the British Parliament . . . MAX M. KORSHAK, LL.B., counselor at law . . . ROBERT H. BREMNER, Ph.D., member, department of history, Ohio State University . . . JOHN C. LINCOLN, chairman of the board, Lincoln Electric Company . . . HORACE S. FRIES, Ph.D., professor of philosophy, University of Wisconsin . . . KLAUS L. HANSEN, consulting electrical engineer, contributor to electro-technical literature.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HENRY GEORGE

By George Raymond Geiger, Ph.D.
PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY, ANTIOCH COLLEGE

A book with wide appeal for those interested in philosophy, sociology, economics and government.

DR. JOHN DEWEY SAYS:

"Dr. Geiger has given us a book which meets the contemporary demand for an adequate interpretation of the thought and activity of Henry George regarded as a vital whole and not as an aggregate of isolated parts.

"In connection with every topic he discusses, Dr. Geiger makes it clear that a vital connection between ends, human values and economic means is at the basis of George's distinctive treatment. This fact alone gives a distinctive and timely color to *The Philosophy of Henry George.* Moreover, the significance of Dr. Geiger's treatment does not stop at this point. There is no phase of the work and the influence of Henry George which is not considered. The account of his life and development forms a personal thread which binds all the parts together. This book will enable the reader to obtain a clear and comprehensive view of one of the world's great social philosophers, certainly the greatest which this country has produced."

Blue Cloth—581 pp.—Indexed—$3.00

Obtainable from

Robert Schalkenbach Foundation

50 East 69th Street, New York 21, N. Y.

The AMERICAN JOURNAL *of* ECONOMICS *and* SOCIOLOGY

Published QUARTERLY under grant from the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation in the interest of constructive synthesis in the social sciences.

IN FUTURE ISSUES

(Titles Are Subject to Revision)

International Technological Progress

By RICHARD T. HAMILTON and ROBERT STRAUSZ-HUPE
University of Pennsylvania

Uneasy Alliance: Henry George and British Socialism

By ELWOOD P. LAWRENCE
Michigan State College

Techniques and Philosophy in Industrial Relations

By WILLIAM H. KNOWLES
Michigan State College

Geopolitics of the Mediterranean

By JOSEPH S. ROUCEK
University of Bridgeport

Perception and Value Inquiry

By HORACE S. FRIES
University of Wisconsin

The Business Leader as a Daimonic Figure

By FRITZ REDLICH
Belmont, Mass.

Liberalism in Nineteenth Century America

By LOUIS FILLER
Antioch College

Marx's Theory of the Entrepreneur

By ADRIAN TAYMANS
Research Center in Entrepreneurial History

The Size of the National Debt

By HARRY GUNNISON BROWN
New School for Social Research

Subscription (U. S.), $3 a Year **Single Copies, $1**

50 East Sixty-ninth Street
New York 21, N. Y.